

Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 4967. A bill to provide for operation of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4968. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4969. A bill to provide for operation of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to declare the date of termination of the wars in which the United States has recently been engaged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. J. Res. 288. Joint resolution to provide for the admission to the United States of aliens who are religious or racial refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the current session, relative to the Full Employment Act, for the use of said committee; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Samuel Valente; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4971. A bill to permit Mary J. James to file an application for and to receive a monthly family allowance under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4972. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Stoddard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEWART:

H. R. 4973. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Robert B. Zimmerman; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4974. A bill for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4975. A bill for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 4976. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Fortunato; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresa Ebrecht; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 4978. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Carrie A. Hoover; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 4979. A bill for the relief of Mrs. L. L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1398. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., protesting

the enactment of S. 1171, the Ball-Hatch bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1399. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Murray-Patman full employment bill; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1400. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the seaman's bill of rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1401. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., protesting the enactment of H. R. 32, the Hobbs bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1402. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., protesting the enactment of H. R. 2788, the Gwynne bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1403. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Chavez-Norton bill for a permanent FEPC; to the Committee on Labor.

1404. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Pepper-Hook 65-cent minimum wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1405. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., protesting the enactment of H. R. 3937, the Arends bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1406. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Kilgore-Forand unemployment insurance bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1407. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Wagner-Dingell social-security bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1408. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of a better GI bill of rights; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1409. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the Emergency Council for the Dissolution of the Rankin-Wood Un-American Committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1410. Also, petition of the Emergency Council for the Dissolution of the Rankin-Wood Un-American Committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1411. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Michigan Older Boys' Conference, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to atomic power; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, for a hallowed moment we step aside from the crowded highway to seek the garden of the soul where Thou keepest tryst for us at the cool of the morning hour. Often when we think Thee far away Thou art by our side unrecognized.

In the overwhelming sense of Thy goodness, O God, may all our selfish desires and all our petty egotisms vanish away. Humble us and forgive us, that we may enter into unity with Thee and may become in some measure the instruments of Thy peace. Into Thy hands we commit our spirits in life and in death, which Thou hast told us is but

the swinging gateway to a richer realm of vaster service. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 12, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on December 12, 1945, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sassee, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty King George VI.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2737) for the relief of Clara Black.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2737. An act for the relief of the estate of Harry Leon Black;

H. R. 4407. An act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate letters from the Chairman of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice and the secretary of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending March 31, 1946, which, with accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

Petitions of several citizens of the city of New York, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 40, requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of several citizens of New Orleans, La., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN (for Mr. ANDREWS), from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

S. 1649. A bill to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building at Nashville, Tenn.; without amendment.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4649. A bill to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 856).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1679. A bill to authorize additional compensation for work performed on a legal holiday by employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JOHNSON, of Colorado:

S. 1680. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more liberal rates of increased pension for single amputations due to service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1681. A bill to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1682. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products, until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1683. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Sufronia Andrus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1684. A bill to authorize the Federal Public Housing Commissioner to settle the claims for overtime compensation of certain persons who were employed in connection with the University Homes project; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by vio-

lence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. MORSE each submitted an amendment, and Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HART) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN AND CONDITIONS AMONG TROOPS ABROAD

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have received a number of letters from servicemen overseas complaining about the delay in getting them home, and also commenting on conditions at the places where they are stationed. I should like to have some of these letters printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1303 A. A. F. BASE UNIT,
A. P. O. 884, P. M.,
New York, N. Y., November 25, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I've always admired you for your intensely conscientious regard for the rights of Americans. Perhaps you can give me answers to two or more questions.

Recently, rioting has broken out over different parts of India; it is trouble that has been brewing for quite awhile between the English and Indians. Unfortunately, we Americans are classified as being British Allies in this coming uprising.

A few days ago Americans were killed and a goodly number injured in Calcutta, and in the future this strife will spread. You will agree that any American life lost in such a useless manner is criminal. And yet there has been no real effort to evacuate this theater as soon as possible apparently.

On VJ-day some 227,000 troops were in the India-Burma theater. Now, some 3 months later, only 93,000 personnel have left. At this rate another 4 or 5 months will be consumed to repatriate us.

Is this trouble being hushed up in Washington? It seems to me that we are sitting on a keg of political dynamite which may explode any day.

Will you kindly justify our being so slowly withdrawn from this territory? Is it that we are to help the British?

Hoping you can give the answers to these, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

KALAIKUNDAH AIR BASE,
A. P. O. 493, C. B. I., INDIA,
November 29, 1945.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senator From Montana,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Perhaps I am not conforming strictly to the War Department's

wishes by writing to you while I am still in uniform, but I believe that you should know a few facts concerning the Army's policy in redeploying troops to the United States from the India-Burma theater. Please do not regard this as a personal gripe, as there are thousands of GI's in this theater in the same predicament.

At present, I am assigned to a class IV unit, composed of China theater troops which have been declared as surplus by the War Department. By the orders of the War Department, we are to be redeployed to the United States via India. In the process of our redeployment to the States, we have been intercepted by the India-Burma theater and held at this air base for over a month, doing absolutely nothing, and we have prospects of staying even longer. This has been done for reasons unknown to us.

Our supposition is that we are being held here for the express purpose of closing the India-Burma theater. We hardly think it is a square deal that we should close another theater after closing our own.

During our redeployment to the States, our mail from home has been discontinued and returned to the States. Furthermore, we have been advised that we will not receive any mail until our eventual return to the States, because it would be too much trouble. Consequently, none of us have heard from our homes since the middle of last October. In event sickness or death occurred in our families, we would not find out about it for months.

Another point worthy of mention is the recent shipment of approximately 200 Indian students from Calcutta to the University of Chicago. We GI's would like to know why this shipping space on a troop transport, so valuable to us, was used to bring foreigners to our schools when so many of us GI Joes want to get back to American schools ourselves. It also seems odd, that at various times, ships sailing from Calcutta to the States have advertised in Calcutta newspapers for civilian passengers.

A recommendation endorsed by GI's in this theater is a bonus to be paid enlisted men, who served overseas, equivalent to the 5 cents a mile, and per diem subsistence paid all officers who came overseas. This sum was paid to officers to reimburse them for the money they were supposed to have paid out for traveling and living expenses incurred during the trip. However, such expenses were paid by the Navy, leaving the officers a net profit of approximately \$1,000 each way to this theater.

I realize that I can expect no answer from you as no mail is delivered to us, but knowing your past record and the fine work which you have done, I know that you will do whatever is possible to remedy this situation.

Sincerely yours,

THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-
THIRD PORT BATTALION,
APO 70, November 22, 1945.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: For some time I have debated whether or not to write to you. I realize that your mail is very heavy and that you might not be able to read this letter. But I am taking a chance and even adding clippings which give the sentiments of the men over here. Enclosed also is a clipping which features your interest in our predicament. Believe me, we need some help, and soon, over here.

Perhaps you recall that we have met on several occasions at meetings in Great Falls. My father is John L. Goff, of Valler, Mont., for whom you have already done a great deal. For this we are both grateful.

As to my own career—after completing medical school the Army called me away from my eye residency in Philadelphia and assigned me to a general hospital in the

States. In August I was sent over here to the Philippines and at the present time I am assigned to a unit here at base M, San Fernando. My work consists of taking sick call every day for 1 hour, and that is all. Any good enlisted man could do this job, but, no, I do 1 hour's work daily and draw \$325 a month. And there are hundreds of doctors like me who are just as miserable and as useless. Believe me, it's disgusting, when I could be in Montana doing a much-needed job in an area with a critical shortage of doctors. The medical men in this Army have been thoroughly mishandled. I am an eye doctor, and here I am doing nothing but first aid, while just a few miles away are three hospitals needing eye men. Damn such efficiency! And my case is only one of many.

My next bone of contention is this: When the ASTP program was organized in 1942 they would not give any aid to me, but damn well called me up when my medical school was finished, and thereby interrupting my training. Now the boys finishing ASTP get all the education, worth between \$5,000 and \$10,000, and, in addition, are given one point for every month in medical school. Thus, on completion of their training they have 36 points before doing any actual service with the armed forces. What a lousy stinking deal for the rest of us. Now, none of these men can go overseas to replace us because they have in excess of 30 points. I think that it is a damn injustice. But it is typical of Army inefficiency. Please see what you can do about this injustice.

Now something more general about our base. An army base supports, or should support, combat or other units. But this base supports nothing at present and merely exists for itself and for the convenience of the general who needs men under him in order to keep his nice, easy, lucrative job. There are, at this base, enough officers who want to stay in the Army to operate it efficiently—or at least what the Army calls efficiently. It's really a joke. All we do is have "beautification week," "clean-up week," or "good citizenship week," and the latest is the "best driver campaign." We build fences, remove and replace palm trees or perform some equally ridiculous mission. All this takes manpower and taxpayers' money and eventually it will all be waste. The pay-off is that the official bulletin recently requested an officer or enlisted man who was an ichthyologist to report to headquarters—believe it or not, the general is building himself an aquarium at the reported cost of \$5,000. Still another idiotic episode is that, for the past 5 weeks, he has had a major buying hay for eight horses at the cost of \$3,500. The horses, one of which recently died, are for show to the important guests. Oh, yes, he is also building an aviary. There aren't 10 officers out of a hundred who have a good 3 hours' work to do each day. One lieutenant colonel has the big job of taking a census of the number of troops in the various companies for which the Army is paying him the sum of \$350 monthly. Multiply this by 10,000 and you will see the figures start to rise for our taxpayers. However, these examples are typical of the 50,000 headquarters of the Army where work is being manufactured just to hoodwink the American people and especially Congress. So why are we kept in? Just for the pleasure of the generals who don't want to give up their little kingdoms. Because the Army won't admit how much they have wasted manpower continually and almost fatally. Please, Senator WHEELER, don't let them hoodwink you. The only men who really know what is going on are the ones who are here at the scene.

Talk of demobilization is really a lot of words for the American people to read about. Action is characteristically slow if at all. The reenlistments of both officers and men is sufficiently high to allow all the men who have no desire to make the Army a career to return to civilian life.

There is a lot of thinking going on over here, Senator WHEELER, among the doctors, dentists, lawyers, and others who resolve, that if action isn't forthcoming soon from the present legislative body that there will be some changes made as soon as we get home. A common saying over here is: No boats, no votes. I, for one, intend to make myself heard in the State of Montana when I return, favorably or otherwise. We're tired of all the talk and no action.

Thank you very much for listening, Senator WHEELER. I would appreciate a reply to this letter.

Very truly yours,

MERCHANTVILLE, N. J., December 8, 1945.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Recently I read in the paper of the controversy you and Senator CONNALLY engaged in over the destruction of Army equipment in Australia. I don't know what happened there, but I do know what happened in India, Tezpur, India, anyway.

Soon after the war ended all surplus communications equipment, transmitters, receivers, compasses, etc., were thrown in a pile and run over with a Cle-track. The same treatment was accorded 180 brand new hack watches. One of the navigators in our squadron whose watch wasn't working just right attempted to trade it in for one of these new ones, but was turned down. Of course, the Army wouldn't give any of the watches to the GI's. Does big business run the Army, too, as it seems to everything else? Because the way we figured it out the watches were destroyed solely so as to prevent any inroads on the watch market back home.

One more question: Why hasn't some Congressman had enough gumption to get up in the House or Senate and demand that as a prerequisite to the large loan about to be made Britain that the British immediately withdraw all troops and equipment from Java? The peoples of the Far East, the Indians especially, had been expecting great things from the United States at the close of the war. Instead, no one in Washington as much as raises his voice in favor of the independence of these peoples.

What was the war fought for anyway? The Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" aren't worth the paper they were written on—if they ever were written down—and the Indian people, for one, are already beginning to realize it. The Indian people are kind, friendly, and mild, but even they can stand only so much. Before long they will associate the silence of the United States on the question of Indian independence with acquiescence of British rule of India. This would indeed be a calamity for us.

Respectfully yours,

H. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL,
AN EX-GI.

ECONOMIC AND PRODUCTION GOALS OF FARMERS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of economic and production goals of farmers, delivered by Senator GUFFEY before a farmers' conference at Altoona, Pa., on December 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POTSDAM DECISIONS—EDITORIALS FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Christian Century, dealing with the Potsdam decisions, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Bankhead	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hill	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Huffman	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Shipstead
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Carville	La Follette	Stanfill
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdoch	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM—ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, after conferring with the majority and minority leaders, and with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and having obtained their consent, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the beginning of the session, the Senate proceed to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, which deals with the Palestine problem, and that I may be

permitted to address myself to the resolution when it is taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I present the conference report on H. R. 4129, which is commonly referred to as the reorganization bill, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Reorganization Act of 1945'.

"NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"(1) to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

"(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

"(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

"(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this Act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"(c) It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under this Act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 per centum in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.

"REORGANIZATION PLANS

"SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

"(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

"(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

"(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

"(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

"(5) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the reorganization plan will not have, any functions,

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions, as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of this section and specified in the plan, he has found that such transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function specified in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

"OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

"SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

"(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

"(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more assistant heads of any agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of transfers, consolidations and coordinations made by the plan, the responsibilities and duties of such head are of such nature as to require such action. The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than four years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of \$10,000 per annum, and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition;

"(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with any function or agency transferred, consolidated, or coordinated, as he deems necessary by reason of the transfer, consolidation, or coordination for use in connection with the transferred, consolidated, or coordinated functions, or for the use of the agency to which the transfer is made, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

"(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

"LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of—

"(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or establishing any new executive department; or

"(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as 'Department' or its head as 'Secretary'; or

"(3) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"(4) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"(5) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

"(6) imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function; or

"(7) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office.

"(b) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, and Railroad Retirement Board.

"(c) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to any such civil function. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection.

"(d) No reorganization plan shall provide for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection if it also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Federal Communications Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, United States Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration.

"(e) If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.

"(f) No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the

plan is transmitted to the Congress before April 1, 1948.

"TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS"

"SEC. 6. (a) The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such sixty-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(2) in the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

"(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

"DEFINITION OF 'AGENCY'"

"SEC. 7. When used in this Act, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

"MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS"

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act any transfer, consolidation, coordination, abolition, change or designation of name or title, disposition, winding up of affairs, or provision for the appointment and compensation of the head or assistant heads of an agency, referred to in section 3 or 4, shall be deemed a 'reorganization'.

"SAVING PROVISIONS"

"SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed, in respect of or by any agency or function transferred to, or consolidated or coordinated with, any other agency or function under the provisions of this Act, before the effective date of such transfer, consolidation, or coordination, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer, consolidation, or coordination had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested functions in the agency from which the transfer is made under the plan, such functions shall, insofar as they are to be exercised after the transfer, be considered as vested in the agency to which the transfer is made under the plan.

"(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term 'regulation or other action' means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any

reorganization under the provisions of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such reorganization takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization so effected, or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

"UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS"

"SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this Act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

"PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS"

"SEC. 11. If the reorganizations specified in a reorganization plan take effect, the reorganization plan shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

"TITLE II"

"SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

"(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in section 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term 'resolution' means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan numbered _____ transmitted to Congress by the President on _____, 19____, the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

"SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of ten calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, ten calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

"(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

"SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

"SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

"(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of section 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

"(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

"(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

"(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

PAT McCARRAN,
CARL A. HATCH,
ABE MURDOCK,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
CLARE HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object; this, I take it, is the conference report on the reorganization bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Is it signed unanimously?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; it is.

Mr. WHITE. Have the minority members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate approved the report?

Mr. MURDOCK. They have.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the able Senator who has presented the conference report briefly outline what changes have taken place in conference on the reorganization bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator ask specific questions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. How does the bill as it came from conference differ from the bill as it was passed by the Senate?

Mr. MURDOCK. The bill, as it came from conference, differs from the bill as passed by the Senate in the exemptions retained in the conference report. Some of the exemptions contained in the bill as it passed the Senate were eliminated entirely, and others were placed in a class which, in the event they are contained in any reorganization plan prepared by the President must be set forth separately and must not be included on any plan which also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency. I read from the language of the report:

No reorganization plan shall provide for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection if it also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency.

In other words, the conferees felt that with respect to the agencies, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Veterans' Administration, if the President wanted to reorganize in any way one of those agencies he must do so separately and according to the language just read. He cannot submit to Congress anything in a plan affecting any one of those agencies if it involves a reorganization which does not affect that particular agency. The conferees felt that with respect to those agencies Congress should have the right to pass on them separately and exclusively and thus avoid combining them with numerous other agencies.

The agencies which were wholly exempted in the conference report are the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board. The only way that any of the agencies just named can be reorganized or affected by reorganization is by the addition to them of some other agency, some other bureau, some other personnel, or adding to the functions they already exercise. But nothing can be taken away from them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Specifically, for my own information, I wanted to find out what agencies had been eliminated from the bill as passed by the Senate. For instance, the Maritime Commission, and I think several other agencies which were

inserted in the bill by the Senate have been stricken out by the conferees.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Maritime Commission went out and the land banks, the Federal Power Commission, and one or two other agencies. We were unable to get the House conferees to agree with respect to them. We were successful, however, respecting the ones which I have named, in agreeing that any reorganization of them must be brought before Congress separately.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was held in committee and have not had the benefit of the Senator's statement. Will he be good enough to repeat the status of FDIC under the conference report?

Mr. MURDOCK. The FDIC is included in that category of agencies which cannot be reorganized if the plan in which they may be affected provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency, but they are subject to reorganization in a separate and exclusive plan. The House conferees were unwilling to agree to their entire exemption, along with the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board, but did agree to exempt them from any reorganization plan that involves a reorganization which does not affect such agency. So, if the President sees fit to reorganize the FDIC he must send up a separate plan dealing with FDIC alone.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, for instance, if there were an attempt to close the FDIC into, let us say, the Comptroller's office, what would the situation be?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would say that the President could, under the bill, send up a plan which would transfer the FDIC to the Comptroller of the Currency or, let us say, to the Federal Reserve System, but nothing else could be included in that reorganization not affecting the FDIC. So the Congress has the right to pass exclusively on the question whether or not it wishes anything done with the FDIC or any other agency included in this category.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator tell me on what possible theory the SEC is considered to be more sacred from tampering than the FDIC?

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot explain that, but I am sure the Senator understands that in conferences of this kind there must be an attitude of give and take. The Senate conferees felt that they did the best they possibly could in the matter, and we are hopeful that the Senate will agree to the conference report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator that in conferences an attitude of give and take is necessary; but I am not prepared to agree that any give and take is justified in connection with the status of the FDIC, which is the steel beam under American confidence in the fiscal system of this country. I am very much disappointed that the House of Representatives should have insisted

upon any sort of license to manipulate the FDIC. Without any reflection upon the able Senator from Utah and the service which I know he has rendered—and I know that his sympathy is with the FDIC—I am unable to vote for a conference report which allows any latitude in respect to the FDIC, because I think it is the No. 1, triple A agency of the Government which ought to be exempted.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in full agreement with the Senator as to the very distinguished record which that agency has made, and I would have much preferred to have exempted it entirely, but that was impossible in the conference and our insistence on exemption of FDIC, in my opinion, would have precluded a reorganization law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator tell us what was done with the amendment which I offered, and which was adopted by the Senate, prohibiting any change in legislation enacted by the Congress since the first of January of this year?

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not understand the first part of the Senator's question.

Mr. TAFT. I am asking what was done with the amendment which I offered, which is section 5 (e), I believe, which provided that no change should be made in a reorganization plan contrary to a statute enacted by the Congress since the first of January of this year.

Mr. MURDOCK. We were able to get the House to agree to the following language, which is in the report on page 4:

(e) If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.

The language which the Senator offered to the conference in the way of an amendment was very seriously considered by the conference but ultimately rejected.

Mr. TAFT. The language read by the Senator, which was adopted by the conferees, covers the matters which I had in mind, except that it does not cover the fixing of powers within an agency. Let me cite an example of what I have in mind. The other day we had before us for consideration the hospital bill, and we passed it, with the provision that the Federal Hospital Council should have final authority over the Surgeon General on the question of prescribing regulations with which the States must comply. That was attempted to be changed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senate voted down the proposal and made that power final. It seems to me that the day after this act is passed, under a reorganization plan the President could reverse that action and take away that power within the agency from the Federal Hospital Council and give it back to the Surgeon General.

I realize the difficulties which the Senator had, but I believe that if any reorganization plan should be submitted deliberately reversing an action of that kind which the Congress had just taken, even though there were other important things in the plan, I would feel called upon to oppose it. I hope the President will feel that he should not in any case reverse any action taken by the Congress since January 1, even with respect to the fixing of powers within an agency which is not now covered by the amendment, because I believe it would endanger the success of the entire plan if he should do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the Senator that when the Congress has deliberately taken certain action it would be inconsistent for the President, having approved such action, to interfere with it by reorganization. However, I invite the Senator's attention to this factor, which was the basis of the objection of the House conferees to the intra-agency reorganization which would be precluded if the language suggested by the able Senator had been included in the bill: The House conferees pointed out that in nearly every appropriation bill there are many intra-agency distributions of functions which are given of necessity little attention by the Congress, and that if the language which was suggested by the Senator had been included, whatever was done in any of the appropriation bills would be a prohibition against the President interfering with or changing anything in the way of functions which had been prescribed in an appropriation bill. The House conferees felt that such a provision would be too restrictive.

Mr. TAFT. If we should see fit to place legislation in an appropriation bill, I do not see why it would not be like any other legislation. I quite agree that if it were merely a restriction on the use of funds for a year, it would be quite proper to change it.

Mr. MURDOCK. The difficulty we had was in finding language which would fit that kind of a situation.

Mr. TAFT. I appreciate what the Senator has done.

Mr. MURDOCK. We did everything we could to try to meet the views of the Senator. The Senator knows what my attitude was on the floor of the Senate toward his amendment. I thought it was a reasonable amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it correct to say that under the existing parliamentary situation a motion to recommit the bill to the conferees would not be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House having already agreed to the report, such a motion would not be in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So it is impossible to move to recommit. Therefore, if Senators wish to object to the conference report, the only course left is to vote down the conference report, which would permit of a new conference. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A further conference could be asked.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I am left with no alternative to voting against the conference report. I am very sorry to be compelled to take that position. I realize that the able Senator from Utah has probably done everything within his power under the existing circumstances to obtain an agreement with the House. However, if the Senate were to take this action, perhaps the House might realize more definitely how deeply some of us feel about this matter, and might reconsider. I have the total conviction that there is nothing so important at this uncertain moment of flux in the economic life of America as that the American people should continue to be able to sleep at night in respect to the sanctity of their banking system and the security of their deposits. If it had not been for the total and magnificent confidence which the American people had in their banking system and the sanctity of their deposits as a result of the operations of the FDIC during the past 12 hectic years, God only knows what would have happened in the United States. We are still in the throes of the same economic uncertainty. The one thing which the American people are sure of is that their bank deposits are safe. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been magnificently operated and has made a superb contribution to American confidence during these difficult days. I know of nothing more important, as a matter of fundamental psychology, than that it should be removed from any possibility of suspicion that it is going to be manipulated into some sort of a different status or a different organization; and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to ask the Senate to vote "no" on the conference report, under those circumstances.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan that this matter was a subject of discussion among the conferees, and I hope the Senator realizes that two classifications are provided for. One forbids touching in any way certain designated boards or agencies, and the other implies that there may be possible improvements or strengthening of some boards, and, if so, it provides that each must be handled under a separate recommendation by the President, not under a general plan. I was willing to have the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation included in the second class, with the understanding that if the President sends to Congress a plan regarding the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, it can be acted on separately. But by adopting such a provision we do not exclude it from the possibility of improvement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, some of the agencies are given full protection; some are given half protection. I will ask my able friend the Senator from New Jersey to indicate to me any agency to which the conference report gives full protection, which is as remotely important to the American psychology of

individual security in these days as is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. SMITH. I agree absolutely with the Senator's implication. I know of nothing more important, and in the conference I took the position that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should come under class 1, the class of agencies to be entirely exempted. But there were arguments on the other side. Inasmuch as the President would have to give the Congress his full reasons for suggesting the reorganization of such agencies and inasmuch as there was a desire to have the possibility of reorganization made as broad as possible, I thought it might be wise to cover the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the report and to provide that it should be left open to strengthening and improvement. We all agree regarding its value and importance in the period of reconstruction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has said that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is put in this twilight zone by the conference report in order to leave it open to strengthening and improvement. Of course, any plan which might be proposed for reorganization would be offered in the name of improvement and strengthening. That is not the point. The point is that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is so fundamentally important in this continuing period of economic flux in America, so fundamentally important to the confidence of the American people in the security of their bank deposits, and the only source of the absolute feeling of security which they now have respecting any phase of their economic life—I say it is so important that we should not invite even an argument over some form of reorganization which is alleged to be in the interest of improvement. There is no justification on the record, Mr. President, for contemplating that this particular agency can be reorganized by way of improvement, because it has been 100 percent successful in every objective to which it has been directed. Furthermore, it has been operated at a minimum of expense, with a maximum of success, so that it now represents a billion-dollar asset to the Federal Government. It is in a position to repay every penny which ever was put into it. It has a record which defies comparison with that of any other instrumentality of the Government; and if some instrumentalities are to be set to one side as totally free of any danger of any manipulation, I submit this is the agency of all agencies which belongs in that classification.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator have any objection to taking the powers of examination from the Comptroller of the Currency, let us say, and giving them to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not sure whether I have any objections. I realize the argument which can be made

for consolidating the examinations of banks; but I know of no advantage to be gained from that particular procedure which remotely would compensate for the danger to the confidence of the American people in the security of their bank deposits which would result from opening even a back door to an assault upon the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator's whole argument is predicated, as I understand it, on the assumption that the President of the United States would have some reason to injure an agency for which he voted, which was sponsored by the administration to which he belonged, and in which, in my opinion, his interest is just as sincere as is the interest of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree that undoubtedly the President has that interest. My argument is not predicated upon the premise the Senator has indicated. My argument is premised on the fact that this conference report does identify half a dozen agencies of the Government which are considered to be so important that they must be in a preferred class, but the conference report does not put the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in that preferred class.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President—

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for this question—

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield again to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly the Senator knows the distinction, without my elaborating on it here, between the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I certainly do know the distinction, and the Interstate Commerce Commission does not for an instant measure up to the importance in the intimate life of the American people today which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has.

Mr. MURDOCK. I admit that. But its functions are entirely different. They are quasi legislative and quasi judicial; that is true.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. As soon as the Senator from Utah has concluded, I shall yield to the Senator from California. I am yielding to the Senator from Utah at the moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, if the Senator from California has something more important to say, I shall be glad to subside.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from California as soon as the Senator from Utah has concluded.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the distinction which was made was not carried through to its logical conclusion with reference to some other agencies. But that is the distinction which was made in regard to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is exclusively and wholly an executive or administrative agency, rather than one with quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative powers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator say that the Securities and Exchange Commission is in that classification?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; it has certain quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a far stretch of the imagination for me—

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not question the statement the Senator has made, namely, that today no agency of Government is more closely related to the individual citizen than is the FDIC. But I think it is a little unfair to assume that the present President of the United States would do anything to injure or interfere with the great record which has been made by the FDIC. We should not forget in our debate that the FDIC is a creature of the Roosevelt administration; that a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress may be depended upon to protect this great and important agency from any real or even imaginary injury. I know of no law enacted during my tenure of office in Congress from which I get more comfort and take greater pride in than the law which launched the FDIC. I assure the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I will be constantly on the alert for any plan affecting this agency.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me stop the Senator there. I am making no such assumption as he implies. But I may say that when we do not put the FDIC in the top classification where it is exempt from reorganization, but in a lower classification where there is an invitation to some sort of reorganization, we are taking from it the maximum protection which we are giving to other agencies. My argument is not based in any way whatsoever upon any lack of confidence in the President. It is based solely on the proposition that so long as we have any categories, the FDIC is entitled to be placed in the top category.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in view of the very emphatic and determined position which is being taken by the Senator from Michigan, and the extent to which the debate is proceeding, I am reluctantly compelled to call for the regular order of business.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. The conference report cannot be set aside, can it, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only point to which privilege attaches is the presentation of the report. The determination of it is not privileged. The Senator from California has a right to demand the regular order.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator from California will not insist upon his demand. This is a very important report, and it must be disposed of before the recess.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I must admit that I am in a very embarrassing position. For about 10 days the acting

majority leader has been requesting from time to time that the Senate lay aside consideration of the Federal pay bill. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has notified me that he will attempt to proceed with the deficiency bill late this afternoon, and unless some agreement is reached not to continue with consideration of the Federal pay bill, I believe the proper thing to do under all the circumstances with which the Senate is now familiar, is to proceed with consideration of the bill at this time. The Senator will remember that I endeavored to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Virginia, our acting majority leader, and other Senators, by agreeing that the Federal pay bill might be put over until noon today. I thoroughly understand the jeopardy I am in, but I most assuredly think that the Federal pay bill has rights. If I can now force consideration of that bill I shall attempt to do so. Of course, if for some reason of its own the Senate wants to take a different viewpoint, the responsibility is off my conscience.

Mr. HILL. So far as the agreement was concerned to postpone consideration of the Federal pay bill until some time today, I do not think I was a party in requesting that that be done. I believe that the Senator from California acceded to the wishes of the Senator from Virginia. The conference report will have to be disposed of before there may be any recess. It has been under consideration already for approximately 40 or 45 minutes. I certainly hope that the Senator from California will permit the Senate to proceed to final action on the report.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, I think that the Senate of the United States is placing itself in a cubious position by trying, through one method or another, to impede consideration of the Federal pay bill. If it is desired not to proceed with its consideration, I shall be willing to wait until a quarter after 1 o'clock. The Senator from Michigan has assumed a strong position with regard to the conference report. I have no way of knowing how much time consideration of the report may consume. The Federal pay bill has been on the Senate floor for a very considerable period of time, and the conference report has only just been presented to the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator will acquit me of any purpose to interfere with his program.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to say immediately and very emphatically that I desire to give the Senator from Michigan, as well as other Senators, full latitude in arguing the very important matter which has been discussed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am willing to present my objections to what I consider to be a very vital weakness in the conference report.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am certain that within a very few days if only the Federal pay bill is before the Senate we will not have a quorum. I know that the distinguished leaders will keep a quorum

present in order to dispose of the conference report. However, we owe the million and a half or two million employees of the Government the obligation of acting upon this bill. I am not anticipating what any Senator will do, but I do know that the bill has been before the Senate for at least 10 days.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How many employees did the Senator state?

Mr. DOWNEY. I said a million and a half or two million.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well; I am speaking in behalf of 60,000,000 bank depositors in the United States.

Mr. DOWNEY. Allow me to say that so long as the conference report is pending its rights are certainly not being imperiled.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Rule 27 provides that "the presentation of conference reports shall always be in order." I think the conference report has been presented. Am I correct in understanding that the conference report has been presented, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been presented, and the presentation of a conference report is always in order.

Mr. TAFT. The rule further provides that "when received, the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate." I raise the question, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No motion has been made. If it is made, it is entitled to be voted upon.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report. That motion is not debatable, Mr. President, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. When a conference report is taken up by unanimous consent, is there any need for a motion of the kind which has been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report has already been brought before the Senate for consideration, but the regular order has been called for. When the regular order is called for, a motion may be made to proceed with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in this connection. I want to subscribe, if I may be privileged to do so, to the remarks which have been

made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I believe that if there is any agency of the Government which is entitled to complete exemption under the reorganization proposal, it is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I may also say, Mr. President, that for the life of me I cannot understand the reason for the treatment which has been given by the conferees to the Federal Power Commission. The Federal Power Commission belongs in the same category with the other agencies which have been exempted, and yet it has been left naked to the winds. I cannot understand what motivated the conferees in according such treatment to that agency unless it be that the agency has been active in protecting the consumers of this country.

Mr. President, I find myself in a position where I must oppose the conference report on the grounds stated.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the only answer to the Senator from Wisconsin is that both Houses of Congress have acted on the reorganization bill. Congress wants reorganization, and if the conferees on the part of the Senate had taken the position that they would not deviate from the Senate's position, of course, there would be no reorganization.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the conferees on the part of the Senate had taken the position that some logic should be applied in the treatment of these various agencies and had required the House conferees to return to the House and request that a separate vote be taken on the proposition in that body, I think they would have been in a much better position than they are now in.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will always be willing to underwrite the logic which motivates the actions of either House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I will not be willing. I would prefer to be in a position where I felt that the Senate conferees had been willing to make a fight for the position of the Senate to the point of forcing the House conferees to take the matter to the House for a separate vote, than to permit a situation to arise which might result in a perfectly illogical determination of what agencies of the Government are to be excluded from the proposed legislation and what ones are not to be excluded. The Senator cannot find logic in the treatment which has been accorded the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. MURDOCK. I might not find logic which would be satisfactory to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin; but his implication that the Senate conferees did not make a fight is incorrect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They did not make a fight to have the conferees on the part of the House take the proposition back to the House for a vote.

Mr. MURDOCK. Because the House conferees assured us that it would be futile to do such a thing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They always do that.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In other words, the Senate conferees caved in before they made a last-ditch fight.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think it is fair to say that there was any caving in. We made all the fight we thought was justified in the light of the ultimate objective of getting a reorganization bill.

Mr. President, every Senator can stand on his feet and make a plea for some agency of government that should have been exempted. We went through that for 20 days here on the floor. The same thing is true of the debate in the House of Representatives. Now, if we have got to go through that same debate and same argument again on the conference report, my claim is that there will be no reorganization in the executive department.

I hope that the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I find myself unable to vote in favor of the adoption of the conference report. The reason for my position in this matter has been very extensively stated on previous occasions but in order that there may be no possible misunderstanding as to the basis on which I shall be unable to vote for the report and shall vote against it, I call attention specifically to one portion of the report. It is provided on the first page of the conference report:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following—

And on page 4 of the conference report, included in the language which is to be inserted, is the following:

SEC. 6. (a) The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

Mr. President, I shall be unable to support the conference report for the reason that in my opinion the language which is thus proposed to be inserted violates the Constitution of the United States of America as a delegation of legislative power to the President.

I shall not undertake to argue extensively this proposition. My position upon the matter is clear and is set forth with the best clarity of which I am capable in previous reports of the debates upon the reorganization bill. I do not care to go over the argument again, but I wish once more to refer to section 1 of article I, of the Constitution of the United States, which reads:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Likewise I refer to the language which appears in the case of Field against Clark in a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States from the lips of Mr. Justice Harlan, in One Hundred and Forty-third United States Reports, page 649:

That the Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President is a principle universally recognized as vital to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. What does the Senator say as to this constitutional question: Congress had the power to create these departments, which it did, for when the Constitution was first adopted they did not exist. Since it had the power to create them originally and has the power to abolish them entirely, does it not have the power to supervise their reorganization and to authorize the President, as a ministerial matter, to reorganize them and change their functions?

Mr. DONNELL. The question asked by the distinguished Senator from Texas raises again the proposition which was presented here extendedly some few weeks ago, namely, that this bill, in the first place, does not set up standards by which the President shall act which are sufficiently definite or clear to save it from the prohibition contained in the constitutional provision I have read.

It is true that Congress had a perfect right to create these various agencies, and by like token, inasmuch as the right to create them rests in Congress, the right undertaken to be delegated by this bill cannot be delegated to the President of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If Congress should pass an act authorizing the President of the United States on the 1st of next January to abolish the OPA, would that be constitutional?

Mr. DONNELL. I should say that that would involve a statute or the repeal of a statute and would be clearly a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I am not familiar with all the details of the creation of the OPA, whether or not by regulation, whether or not by statute, or what the provisions are, but I undertake to say and to repeat that where Congress has within itself power to create an agency, and has created it, it cannot delegate to the President of the United States the power to repeal the legislation which the Congress has itself enacted.

I have cited on other occasions a number of decisions of the Supreme Court and one of the upper or appellate courts—the Circuit Court of Appeals—on this proposition. I have referred also on this floor to the statement in the report of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate concerning the provision of the bill, setting forth that the contemplated reorganization would take effect unless it was disapproved by one House of Congress, and I have cited the fact that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate in its report has itself not once, but at least four times, definitely and clearly in express language stated that the procedure thus proposed is a delegation of legislative power.

Mr. President, we have no ability, no power to transfer to the President the duties which rest upon the shoulders of Congress. We have not merely powers, Mr. President, we have responsibilities. The exclusive law-making power of our Government is possessed by the Congress of the United States and not by the

President of the United States, and no action which this body, or both Houses of Congress, can take can legitimately, legally, or constitutionally delegate that power or responsibility to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I trust my position in this matter is clearly contained within the records of the debates. I shall not argue it further, but I wish to make it perfectly clear that, upon sound ground, as I see it, that the legislation proposed as set forth in the conference report violates the Constitution of the United States, as constituting a delegation of legislative power, I shall decline to vote for the conference report.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that under the provision of the proposed statute, if it be enacted, it will be possible for the President to prepare and transmit to Congress measures which will have the full force and effect of law, setting aside, repealing, or altering existing provisions of law which have endured already, perhaps, for a hundred years, in some cases, and if Congress does nothing whatsoever with respect to the proposed plan of reorganization, it will become effective. If that is not a delegation of legislative power to the President it seems to me it is impossible to find or imagine an instance in which a delegation of power would occur.

I stated a few moments ago, Mr. President, that there are no adequate standards provided by the bill by which the President of the United States shall be governed in the proposed preparation and transmittal of a reorganization plan. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], now presiding over the Senate, will doubtless recall that if the President shall find, in substance, that the reorganization plan which he prepares will conduce to the orderly transition from war to peace conditions, his reorganization plan may be drawn and will become effective if every Member of Congress shall go to sleep, shall go home for the Christmas holidays, or lock up his office and take no action whatsoever.

Mr. President, as I see it, no Members of the Senate, so far as I know, are opposed to the reorganization of the governmental agencies known as the executive agencies. I see sitting in the Senate Chamber this afternoon the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has valiantly presented to the Senate and to the Nation the importance of further economy in National Government and the importance of reorganization. I recall now, as I did a few days ago, that the distinguished Senator from Virginia has totally and exactly reversed himself from the position which he took in 1939 on this question of delegating power to the President. He very frankly stated to the Senate a few days ago, in substance, that he is doing so from a consideration of desperation, as he put it, at the inability, in his judgment, to procure a reorganization unless the powers proposed to be vested in the President by the bill shall be so vested in him.

Mr. President, I insist today, with all the vigor and earnestness within my power, that considerations of expediency

should never be permitted to overcome or overwhelm us in the performance of the duties which every Member of the Senate has sworn or taken affirmation to follow and support. I undertake to say that the proposed legislation provides no adequate standards, provides nothing which, by the strongest stretch of the imagination, it seems to me, can constitute an adequate standard by which the President shall be governed. The proposed legislation leaves it to the President to prepare a plan which may set aside statutory enactments of the Congress over a century of time. Under it the plan so prepared shall become effective, not conditioned upon approval by Congress, but conditioned upon non-disapproval by Congress, a plan under which, as I have said, every Member of Congress could go to sleep, or lock up his office, or go home and do nothing for the remainder of his term, and still the provisions of the statute would become binding law in the United States.

I say such a plan as that is clearly violative of the Constitution of the United States; that it amounts clearly to an attempt to delegate to the President a legislative power, and constitutes, clearly, as the Committee on the Judiciary, composed of some 17 Members of the Senate, said at four different places in its report, a delegation of legislative power; and I quote verbatim from the report, I think.

I submit, Mr. President, that it is a clear violation of our constitutional duties to enact the legislation as it is set forth in the conference report. Therefore I shall be unable to support the report, although I am for reorganization. I am for a reorganization which shall be prepared, perhaps, by the President and transmitted to Congress. I have no objection to that. Perhaps it may be prepared by Congress, but certainly it should be a reorganization which will not go into effect unless it shall have first received the affirmative approval of both Houses of the United States Congress, in which exclusively, under the Constitution of the United States, the entire legislative power of our Government is vested.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as one of the conferees on behalf of the Senate, I feel that I should make a statement in view of the debate which has preceded this morning.

Let me say that when the legislation upon reorganization was first started, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering the legislation, I took the position that any reorganization should be written into a bill in complete form, and presented to the President. I held to that position for some length of time. However, I was told by some of my elders of the Senate that it could never be done, that it was not workable, that reorganization could never be obtained if that method were pursued. I gave way to the views of those who had dealt with the subject longer than I had.

If proof ever were needed of the correctness of my advisers, it has been afforded here this morning. Every Senator has his own view, particularly as to what agencies of the Government should be reorganized. I shall not debate this

morning that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should be or should not be reorganized. The fact is that I hold to the view stated by the Senator from Michigan. I shall not debate the subject whether or not the Federal Power Commission should be exempted totally. But I do say to the Senate that the Senate conferees met day after day upon the bill and earnestly supported the bill that was passed by the Senate. I further wish to say that if the conference report shall be voted down and returned to conference, I do not believe we will get a bill on reorganization.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should not want to have that happen. I respectfully suggest to the Senator that if the conference report shall be voted down and a new conference sought, and the House conferees are asked to take this one item back to the floor for a separate vote, I do not see how they can resist the request, and I should be willing to abide by the result.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator refers to the one item in which he is interested. The Senator from Wisconsin is interested in another item. The Senator from Missouri says he cannot support the report because it provides the feature of double veto by the Congress upon the report.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Not the question of double veto; it is the fact that the bill does not reserve to the Congress the right first to approve the plan before it shall become effective. I do not regard as particularly important, from the standpoint of constitutionality, the question whether the disapproval of one House or the disapproval of both Houses shall be that which shall prevent the act from going into effect. My point is that the plan which shall be presented by the President should not go into effect unless it first receives the approval of both Houses of Congress by joint resolution of the two Houses.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think I understand the position of the Senator from Missouri quite well.

If we go back to conference and obtain one change, or obtain two changes, there will still exist opposition to the bill. In my opinion, therefore, Mr. President, it comes down to this: The Senate conferees have done the best they could to bring forth a bill for reorganization which would be passed by the House of Representatives, and we hope would be passed by the Senate. We have met time after time in the conference. I myself had to give up something in the bill which I urged very strongly and thought was necessary, and which I know would be an improvement to the bill. That was the feature that a proposed reorganization plan could not stay in committee longer than 10 days, and would then automatically come to the floor of the Senate. I could not get an agreement on that proposal. But I signed the report—why? Because I believe the bill is of

sufficient scope to permit reorganization and to permit the Congress to protect the people and to protect its own position when the plan of reorganization comes back to Congress for us to pass upon.

In summary let me say that I do not think recommitting the bill to conference will help. I further say that if the report is rejected by the Senate, the House having accepted it with provisions in it which the House did not want to accept, but which the Senate had placed in the bill—I say that if it is rejected we shall have taken a step which I believe will mean an end to the reorganization of the Federal agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on that question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Bankhead	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hill	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	Knowland	Shipstead
Carville	La Follette	Smith
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdoch	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 4129. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Mary-

land [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is detained at an important committee meeting.

I wish to announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—49

Bankhead	Hart	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hill	Radcliffe
Buck	Hoey	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Lucas	Smith
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McKellar	Tunnell
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Fulbright	Magnuson	Walsh
George	Maybank	Wheeler
Gerry	Mead	Wiley
Gossett	Mitchell	Willis
Green	Murdoch	
Guffey	Murray	

NAYS—23

Austin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	Shipstead
Bridges	Knowland	Taft
Brooks	La Follette	Tobey
Capper	Langer	Vandenberg
Donnell	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Cordon	Saltonstall
Andrews	Glass	Stanfill
Bailey	Hatch	Stewart
Brewster	Huffman	Taylor
Briggs	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	McFarland	Tydings
Butler	Overtton	Wherry
Capehart	Pepper	Wilson

So the conference report was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to call for the regular order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I withhold it for a moment.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows, of course, what would be the effect of his request for the regular order, namely, that the ship sales bill, which has been under consideration now for several days, would be sent back to the calendar. I hope the Senator from California will not request the regular order, but will give us an opportunity to conclude consideration of the ship sales bill. I understand that the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] have been in conference with respect to the bill, and that neither one of the three will desire to speak for more than 5 minutes, if the Senate is given an opportunity to proceed with the consideration of that bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, reluctantly I must decline to accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from California, in justice to myself, that yesterday afternoon, when I talked to the Senator along about 3 o'clock, I thought he agreed that we would have an opportunity to finish action on the ship sales bill early in the session today.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I did not so understand any statement I made. I regret it if I was ambiguous or if the Senator misunderstood me. I will say to the Senator that I understood from the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], that there is considerable doubt whether the deficiency appropriations bill will be before the Senate before Monday. I think that will give us ample time in which to dispose of the Federal pay bill and also the ship sales bill.

I may say that I think the program is understood, namely, that the Senator from Virginia is to present to the Federal pay bill an amendment which will embody his ideas, and after he has explained his amendment it is my intention to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I do not believe I shall occupy the floor of the Senate in discussion of the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from Virginia or in discussion of my own amendment more than 1 hour, and I think the question can easily be settled upon a vote either on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia or on the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I shall offer. Of course, I have no way of knowing how long the Senator from Virginia will address the Senate in the presentation of his thoughts or how long any of our other colleagues will address the Senate in presenting their views on these matters. But if we begin now to work on the Federal pay bill, I think there is no reason why we cannot conclude action on it this afternoon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not sure the Senator from California has accurately stated what I told him. I wish to make a statement at this time about the deficiency appropriations bill. I have no desire to interfere in any way with action on the Federal pay bill; but the Senator from California will recall that I received permission to report the deficiency appropriations bill if we were able to report it today. We received permission to leave it with the clerk. If it is reported today, it will be in order for the Senate to consider it tomorrow. We have been working on the bill for several weeks. It contains a great many items—in fact, more than I have ever before known to be in a deficiency bill since I have been in the Senate. I do not think the bill involves any controversy; and if we are able to have it reported this afternoon, I should like to have time tomorrow to have the Senate consider it. I hope its consideration will not take over an hour, because there is not much controversy about it, in my judgment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say that I have already agreed with the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee that, so far as I am concerned, I shall make no objection to having his bill heard immediately, whenever he desires to present it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I join in the hope expressed by the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from California will not insist at this time upon the regular order, which will mean the consideration at this time of the pay bill. We have shifted these bills back and forth during the last 10 days, from unfinished business to a place somewhere in the rear of unfinished business. I think it has not been a creditable performance, so far as the Senate is concerned. I do not think it has reflected credit upon the legislative processes of the Senate. I do not suppose anyone is more definitely hostile to the ship-sales bill than I am; but here we are with that bill well toward the end of its consideration before this body. From all that I can learn about the situation, I feel quite assured that it will ultimately be disposed of one way or the other within a reasonable time this afternoon. It seems to me—and I say this with great respect to the Senator from California who proposes that the Senate proceed otherwise—that it is in the interest of the orderly conduct of our business that we hold our hands to the plow and go to the end of the furrow with the particular bill which has been before the Senate for so long. When we have concluded action on it, I assume we then shall be in a position to take up the Federal pay bill, and I hope for a speedy determination of it.

But if at this time we suspend consideration of the ship-sales bill and turn our attention to another bill, I think we shall add confusion and legislative delay, and I think we shall create some doubt in the public mind regarding whether we know what we are doing.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I agree with what the distinguished Senator has said, namely, that once we have put our

hand to the plow, we should go to the end of the furrow before we leave it. We started on the Federal pay bill long before we started to consider the ship-sales bill. I tried to be courteous and I yielded to Senators two or three times upon representations—which I know were made in good faith, but which were not carried out—that action on the bill would be finished within a certain period of time.

Mr. President, I shall be frank with the Senate and with the acting majority leader. I have received very good information that when the deficiency appropriations bill and the ship-sales bill are out of the way, it will no longer be possible to obtain the attendance of a quorum in the Senate. I have no doubt that there are Senators who would be very glad to avoid having to pass upon this wage question by not having a quorum present. But I desire to say it will be against all my resistance if that happens. If my bill goes down, I shall attempt to see that the ship-sales bill, at least, is not considered in front of it. I may not be able to accomplish that.

Let me say that we waited 4 or 5 years before we raised the basic pay of the Federal workers. For 4 or 5 long years we, the Congress of the United States, helped to work out plans by which the greatest corporate profits which ever have been made were accumulated, plans by which the farmers were protected, plans by which industrial workers were protected. But it was not until the spring of 1945, 4 years after the cost of living had begun to mount, that we got around to attending to an increase of the basic salaries of Government workers.

I wish to say that what I am requesting for the Government workers is nothing more than what has already been granted by 25 or 50 great industries; it is nothing more than General Motors has already offered.

In other words, in the substitute which I am about to offer for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] I am doing nothing more than attempting to bring the wages of Federal workers up to the present standard of living. So far as I know, no one in industry objects to that plan. Justice delayed is justice denied. There are hundreds of thousands of Federal workers who will face bleak and insolvent conditions at Christmas. So far as I am concerned, I shall do everything I can do in order to drive this bill through before we leave for the holiday adjournment, and I shall not yield for anything. If Senators wish to displace my bill, I shall go home and rest easily.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator from California has been so patient and generous that I hesitate to say anything at this time. What has been said by the Senator from Maine and by the Senator from Alabama with regard to disposing of the proposed ship-sales legislation is obviously correct and I shall not dwell upon it. However, I have talked with several Senators and I know of only two or three Members of the Senate who will discuss the bill, and not one of them has told me that he will talk longer than 5 minutes. I cannot guarantee what may develop; but I assert

to the Senator from California that, so far as I can now judge from the appearance of things, we can vote quickly on these matters.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, though not so wise as Ulysses was, I am like Ulysses in that my ears are stuffed with cotton and I shall no longer listen to the song of the siren. I shall not yield any further. There is cotton in my ears.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. I understand that the Senator will insist on the regular order.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will be so much like St. Paul that he will yield to no one, and will drive his bill just as hard as he possibly can do so. I may say further that I shall be here to help the Senator dispose of the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to my distinguished friend from Alabama that I shall take his advice.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a ranking member of the minority on the Civil Service Committee, I wish to say that I believe the distinguished Senator from California is absolutely correct in his position. The Federal pay bill has been delayed time and again. Any member of the committee who attended the hearings and listened to the testimony offered by poor Federal employees knows that this legislation has long been needed. I am here to help the Senator in every way I possibly can.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California withdraws his amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not desire to have any other of my amendments presented. I understand that it is now the desire of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] to offer an amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I did not understand that the Senator from California was offering a substitute for my amendment. I suggest that he offer an amendment to his own bill, and then I may offer a substitute for his amendment. After he offers his amendment I can then determine whether I wish to offer mine.

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished Senator from Virginia asked me to allow this matter to go over until noon today so that he would have time in which to prepare and present his amendment. I think that the logical and orderly procedure is for the Senator to carry out his program.

Mr. BYRD. I did not make any agreement to that effect. I understood the Senator from California would stand on his bill. He proposes to offer another

bill. I think that when he offers his substitute for the pending bill I will then be in a position to determine whether I wish to offer my amendment. The Senator has not taken me into his confidence and I do not know what kind of a substitute he proposes to offer.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia prefers the procedure which he has suggested, I have no objection to it. I therefore send forward the amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning on page 1, it is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause down to and including line 16 on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That (a) the first sentence of section 405 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: "Each of the existing rates of basic compensation set forth in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except those affected by subsection (b) of this section, is hereby increased by 40 percent of that part thereof which is not in excess of \$1,200 per annum, plus 30 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of \$1,200 per annum."

(b) (1) The proviso to the fifth paragraph under the heading "Crafts, protective, and custodial service" in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "Provided, That charwomen working part time be paid at the rate of 90 cents an hour, and head charwomen at the rate of 97 cents an hour."

(2) Such section is amended so as to provide the following rates of compensation for positions in the clerical-mechanical service:

Grade 1, 92 to 99 cents an hour.

Grade 2, \$1.07 to \$1.15 an hour.

Grade 3, \$1.23 to \$1.31 an hour.

Grade 4, \$1.38 to \$1.54 an hour.

(c) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this section shall not be construed to be an "equivalent increase" in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Sec. 2. Section 602 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words "section 405 of this act", wherever they occur in such section, a comma and the words "as amended."

Sec. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in section 503, each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional compensation computed as follows: 40 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of \$1,200 per annum, plus 30 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of \$1,200 per annum."

(b) The first sentence of section 521 of such act is amended to read as follows: "Each officer and employee in or under the judicial branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional basic compensation computed as follows: 40 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of \$1,200 per annum, plus 30 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of \$1,200 per annum."

(c) Sections 502 and 522 of such act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 4. Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words "by reason of the enactment of this act" the words "or any amendment thereto."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator from California offering the amendment as a substitute for the bill, or as an amendment to the bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am offering it as an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is a substitute for everything except section 5, which is the last section of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator offers it on his own responsibility, and not in behalf of the Civil Service Committee. Am I correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Virginia has performed a valuable service in suggesting the kind of amendment he has suggested. I think it shapes up very well, indeed, the issues and the controversy which exist between me and some other Senators who are opposing the bill.

The Senator from Virginia suggested that he was going to present an amendment which would abrogate the basic raise of 16 percent which was given the employees last spring, go back to the basic rates which existed prior to the new law going into effect July 1, and then give certain increases. I think that is a very excellent form for the bill to take, because I think it makes the issue very clear to Senators.

In the amendment which I am offering to the Senate I am following the same form followed by the Senator from Virginia, so that we can all clearly understand the difference in our two proposals. I might say that, speaking first in a general way, and later with more detailed qualifications, the proposal I am making in the amendment would tend only to bring the Federal workers up to the present higher cost of living standard as compared with that of 1941. In reality the increases which are provided for in my amendment will do nothing except assure to the Federal workers the same real purchasing power they had in 1941.

On the other hand, the Senator from Virginia by his amendment would accomplish the same result for the workers in the lowest groups, but in the upper groups—

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia has not presented any amendment, nor has he made any announcement as to what he intended to offer in conjunction with his colleagues, except to say that he opposed the 20-percent flat increase. I hope the Senator from California will wait until the Senator from Virginia offers an amendment before he attempts to discuss it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may be in error, I may be confusing newspaper reports and other statements—

Mr. BYRD. No statement has been made, I assure the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may be confusing newspaper reports and other statements with the statement the Senator made on the Senate floor, but I thought he did indicate the general nature of his proposal.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is mistaken. I said I favored a graduated increase. I did not say what kind of a graduated increase.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then, Mr. President, to make the controversy clear, assuming the newspaper reports of usually credible columnists are correct as to the nature of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Virginia—

Mr. BYRD. I do not like to interrupt the Senator again, but no newspaper correspondent or newspaper reporter has been authorized by me to say that the Senator from Virginia is in favor of any specific ratio of increase. I assure the Senator that is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, that may be correct, and it may be that I am misinformed as to the ideas presently existing in the mind of the Senator from Virginia, but if I am in any respect in error, of course the Senator from Virginia will correct me.

Mr. BYRD. Would it not be better to let the Senator from Virginia say what is in his own mind, instead of the Senator from California trying to say it, or repeat something from the newspapers which was not authorized?

Mr. DOWNEY. It undoubtedly would have been better, I think, under all the arrangements that were made on the Senate floor, for the Senator from Virginia to have carried out the agreement we made, and for him to have presented—

Mr. BYRD. May I say—

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me finish, please; it would have been better for him to have presented his amendment which he had taken time to prepare.

Mr. BYRD. I was entirely willing to present the amendment on the assumption that the Senator from California would stand by his own bill, on which he held hearings, and which was reported by him in the name of the Civil Service Committee. Now that the Senator from California has changed his bill, I think I am entitled to know what changes he proposes; otherwise I have no way of knowing whether I desire to offer a substitute or an amendment. I think the proper procedure is clearly indicated in this matter.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as I have already said, the proposal contained in the amendment I present does nothing more, in the main, than assure to every Federal worker an increase which will restore to his wages the real buying power they had in 1941.

I have been furnished with a list of perhaps 25 or 30 wage increases which have been given in the United States since the Japanese war, and if my information concerning them is correct—and I feel reasonably confident it is correct—every wage increase so far has at least given the workers a sufficient increase to meet the increased cost of living.

Many of the wage increases which have been given have run 5, 10, 15, and I think even 20 points in percentage above the amount necessary to bring the workers back to the level of the increased cost of living. There have been wage increases in the oil industry, in the tex-

tile industry, in printing, in the lumber industry, and in numerous other industries, and, as I have already said, every one of those adjustments, according to my information and my interpretation, provides a much better standard for the worker than was proposed in my original bill providing for a 20-percent raise and than is proposed in the amendment.

I am informed, I think credibly, that the offer made by the General Motors Corporation to its electrical workers and to its other workers is designed to bring their wages up to that standard of the cost of living. In other words, Mr. President, I am only submitting to the Senate a formula which has been almost exactly duplicated by the General Motors Corporation in its offer to its employees. The employees have not yet accepted the offer, and if and to what extent it will be raised by the General Motors Corporation, of course, I have no idea, but as it stands, the offer of General Motors is almost exactly the same as the formula proposed in the amendment.

Mr. President, the effect of the pending amendment is to eliminate the basic raise which was made last spring, and to substitute upon the then existing wages the percentages of increase set forth in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Murray
Ball	Hart	Myers
Bankhead	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoe	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Shipstead
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Carville	La Follette	Stanfill
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young in the chair). Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the past few moments I have been trying to figure out the exact effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from California, but I am afraid that my efforts have been a complete failure. I certainly would be very loath to vote on this particular amendment or on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] until I had seen it.

I should like to say a few words regarding the general situation. I have not been on the committee, and I have

not been deeply involved in the debate or in the problem which is before us but I have been interested in the general question of wages and salaries. With the confusion which exists with respect to this amendment, it seems to me that the bill should be recommitted to the committee for further consideration.

One further consideration impresses me. The other day the Senator from California made out a very persuasive case for the increase of certain Federal salaries. On the other hand, I know many Federal employees who are well off at their present salaries. It seems to me that there ought to be a selective consideration of the question of raising Federal salaries if we are to do anything as substantial as is now proposed, which would cost the Government between \$500,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000, according to various estimates which have been presented.

Only yesterday I received complaints from Ohio to the effect that some Federal employees are now receiving salaries which completely upset the State scale and make it more or less impossible to hire employees for the State and local governments. The appeal made here is largely in behalf of Federal employees in Washington. Of course the Washington situation is a peculiar one. Hundreds of thousands of people have rushed to Washington to get jobs, creating a short age in housing facilities available in Washington. They have had much higher living expenses than they would have had if they had stayed at home. Washington is probably the worst place there is in that respect, and undoubtedly there are many hardship cases here.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield for that purpose?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Byrd	Knowland	Revercomb
Carville	Langer	Robertson
Donnell	Lucas	Russell
Downey	McClellan	Smith
Gerry	Mitchell	Taft
Gossett	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Hart	Murdock	Tunnell
Hawkes	Murray	Vandenberg
Hayden	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Young
Hill	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BILBO, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MEAD, and Mr. STANFILL answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BALL, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. McKELLAR, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to explain that several members of the Appropriations Committee have been in attendance at the committee in trying to complete consideration of the deficiency bill. It was because of their presence at the committee that they were delayed in arriving in the Chamber.

PERSONAL STATEMENT CONCERNING SHIP-SALES BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a statement relating to yesterday's proceedings?

Mr. TAFT. I would prefer not to yield.

Mr. BYRD. What I have to say will take only 2 or 3 minutes. I wish to make a statement.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator merely desire to correct the RECORD, or to make a statement?

Mr. BYRD. I wish to make a statement, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Very well; I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, yesterday a colloquy took place between myself and the Senator from Maryland. From a reading of the RECORD it might appear that the Senator from Virginia was implicitly criticizing the efficiency with which the Senator from Maryland was handling the bill then pending, the so-called ship-sales bill. I may say, Mr. President, that that was not the intention of the Senator from Virginia. I have great affection and regard, as well as a very high admiration, for the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I do not know of any more diligent, industrious, or able Member of the Senate than is the Senator from Maryland. What the Senator from Virginia was complaining about was the manner in which the ship bill, and the amendment to it which was then pending, had been drafted. I wish merely to read one paragraph of the amendment in illustration of the reason for the objection which was made by me. What I am about to read is a portion of the amendment which had been offered by the Senator from Maryland on behalf of the committee, and which was later rejected. On page 2, beginning in line 4 of the amendment, the following language was set forth:

The dead-weight tonnage of vessels chartered under this subsection to any chartering nation (and its nationals) at any time shall not exceed such percentage of the tonnage under charter or defense aid transfer on September 1, 1945, to the member nation which

has suffered the largest merchant ship war losses, as the tonnage of war losses of such chartering nation is to the said war losses of such member nation, except that the amount chartered hereunder to the chartering nation may in any event be equivalent to the tonnage of vessels under charter or defense aid transfer to such nation on September 1, 1945.

What I have read constitutes one single sentence, beginning in line 4 and ending in line 14 on page 2 of the amendment. In reading the language, one may think he knows what it means until he reaches approximately the middle of the sentence, when he finds that he does not understand it at all. I believe, Mr. President, it would require a half dozen Philadelphia lawyers in order to determine, if they could do so, what the language which I have read means, and each one of them would reach a different version.

Mr. President, I believe that bills to be introduced in Congress should be written in plainer language than the ship-sales bill has been written. There is no reason in the world why such a clause as the one which I have read should be prepared. I exonerate completely the Senator from Maryland. I know that ordinarily Members of the Senate do not actually write bills. I make the observation that bills should be written on Capitol Hill by our legislative drafting employees. They are able, conscientious, and absolutely trustworthy. But during the past few years we have fallen into the custom of accepting for introduction bills which have been prepared by employees of various governmental departments having a particular interest in the enactment of the legislation. I believe that was one of the difficulties experienced in connection with the ship bill, which, in itself, is one of the most difficult, confusing, and vexing pieces of legislation that has ever been presented to the Senate.

Instead of criticizing the Senator from Maryland, I wish to commend him for the explanations which he gave of the bill.

Mr. President, if necessary, the Congress should require that bills to be introduced in either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be prepared either by Members of the Congress or by the employees of the legislative drafting bureaus of the Senate and of the House. I think it is a bad practice to permit the various agencies of the Government to write their own version of legislation and send it to various Members of Congress to be introduced. Much of the legislation which is thus prepared is unintelligible and hard to understand.

I arose to express my high estimation of the splendid capacities of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before the quorum call I expressed the opinion that because of the amendment which was offered by the Senator from California, and the substitute for it which will apparently be offered by the Senator from

Virginia, it is clearly apparent that no one is supporting the committee version of the bill. It seems to me, therefore, to be proper to recommit the bill, together with the amendments, to the Civil Service Committee for further consideration and study.

There is another reason why such further consideration should be given. The proposal is for a flat increase. If we are going to spend \$500,000,000 a year in increasing the salaries of Government workers, it seems to me that we should make the increase a selective one. The Senator from California made an excellent case for certain employees in Washington whose salaries should be increased. On the other hand, there are sections of the country in which Federal employees are among the best paid employees of those communities. No difficulty is experienced in getting persons to take such Federal positions. I think that some kind of selective consideration should be given to the question of who should be raised and who should not be raised. After all, the Washington situation is an extraordinary one. Hundreds of thousands of people were rushed into Washington to occupy Federal jobs. The Government wanted them, and they came to Washington. Their coming resulted in swamping the housing facilities of the city and creating such a housing situation that rents, regardless of control, went up so high that they have now become higher than in any other section of the country, and have created a special war situation which is not typical of the entire Nation. It seems to me that careful consideration and study should be made of the entire subject.

I understand that the chairman of the House committee which will handle the matter has announced that the House will not take up the subject until sometime next spring.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is the Senator from Ohio suggesting that he himself favors discriminating with respect to the wages paid Federal employees in the various localities of the United States because of differences in the cost of living?

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe that it will be feasible to do so. I think there are some classes of employees who deserve an increase and who can make out a case for an increase, whereas on the other hand, there are other classes who cannot do so. I do not think we should base the percentage of increase on what is required in Washington under wartime conditions. That is the point which I was trying to make.

Mr. DOWNEY. In order that I may clearly understand the Senator, let me inquire if he is suggesting that we should pay a stenographer in a certain pay classification in Washington more than we should pay a stenographer in a similar classification in Toledo, Ohio, for example, or in some other city in Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that would be feasible. I think something could be said in favor of it, but I think it would be almost impossible to work it out. It probably could be handled by grading employees outside of Washington at

lower levels, or by grading employees in Washington at higher levels, and I have no doubt that that is now done to some extent.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is the distinguished Senator from Ohio aware of the fact that the statistics indicate that the increased cost of living has been only a fraction of 1 percent greater in the larger towns than in the smaller towns?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and I have not believed the figures. The statistics are very uncertain. They represent only spot checks made here and there, and are not complete. Regardless of the OPA statistics, or the Bureau of Labor statistics, it is fairly clear to me that in certain places of the country living conditions are much worse than they are in other places.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I admire the Senator's judgment and high order of intellect. If he is not suggesting that there be some sort of discrimination in wages based on high cost of living, what is he suggesting?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from California has stated certain extreme cases. Why? I do not know why the committee should consider them, because there are many employees, even in Washington, who are receiving more than they are worth. I know of many persons who, if in private business, would not receive anything like the salaries they are receiving in Government service. I know some who came from college, and when they entered the Government service drew \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year, who in private employment could not have made more than \$1,800 or \$2,400 when they started. I feel very certain that if the Senator will actually make an investigation of the hardship cases to which he has referred, he will find special circumstances which can be dealt with by salary increases in certain fields where increases are needed. But there has been no such study. As I understand, the committee made no study whatever, and obtained no information from the survey groups who make a practice of studying personnel problems and general wage rates, as well as classification problems. Their help was sought when we started to establish the classifications, but it has not been done in the last 2 years that I know of.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. While the Senator may know some men who in his opinion are worth only \$1,500, but who are receiving \$5,000, let me say that there are less than 3 percent of all Government employees in the fortunate position of receiving in excess of \$5,000. I should like to add that the proportion of employees in the Government receiving that kind of salary is substantially less than the proportion in private industry. As a matter of fact, I was very much startled to learn that only about 1 out of every 2,000 employees was classified in the top brackets, receiving \$3,000 or more.

Mr. TAFT. However, the Senator is proposing to raise those in the higher brackets just as much as any others. He is proposing to raise everyone, according to the last amendment, 30 percent over what he was getting a year ago, even if he receives \$9,000 a year. Am I not correct? Do I read the Senator's amendment correctly?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator is correct, except to the extent that there are no raises provided by the bill which will bring any salary about \$10,000. But I should like to say to the distinguished Senator—and I have heard him emphasize this very point, so I am sure it will strike sympathetic ears—in reality I am not trying to raise anybody's salary in real buying power. My only effort is to have all Federal employees paid, in real buying power, at least as much as they received in 1927 and 1941. By our allowing the wages of Federal employees to remain where they are, with the cost of living having increased, those in the higher brackets are now receiving 25 percent less in real buying power than they received in 1941.

Mr. TAFT. I was not dealing with that question. I was dealing with the question whether an automatic increase in all groups in the Federal Government should be made, thus increasing the permanent governmental budget, as I understand, by more than \$500,000,000 a year, or whether we should begin to discriminate a little, find out who is entitled to an increase and who is suffering hardship, and reduce to some extent at least the tremendous cost of the proposed increase.

I agree with the Senator that to the extent there has been a permanent increase in the cost of living, salaries, at least in the lower groups, should be increased to that level—and probably those in the higher grades. To that extent I agree with the Senator. But before we arbitrarily do that for everyone, it seems to me a study should be made to ascertain whether some of those groups are not already getting more than they are entitled to, and whether we cannot in some way reduce the total cost, while recognizing the general principle.

Let me say another thing about the general principle. If the increase is to be permanent—and it is to be permanent, and will probably last forever—we should be fairly sure that the increase in the cost of living will be permanent; and we are not perfectly certain of that. Personally I think it will amount to at least 25 percent. The Government says now it is 33 percent. There may be some reduction in that percentage. I agree, however, that there is to be some permanent increase, yet I am not perfectly certain it will be 33 percent.

I shall vote for an increase—I am not saying I will not—but I think there should be some discrimination, and more complete study of the whole situation, to see how the objective can be accomplished with a somewhat less total cost to the Federal Government than is involved in the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator think that in simple fairness, while the study is being made, we should allow this increase, and set a definite date, 6 months or 8 months or 10 months from now, when it will terminate? The hardship cases the distinguished Senator from California has mentioned are not isolated cases. There are many of them all over the country.

Mr. TAFT. I am not prepared to say what I would do under those circumstances. But that has not been the proposal. We have provided definitely for a temporary increase in the legislative employee field, which will be good until a certain date, and is understood to be temporary. If some such proposal should be made, I would not have so strong a feeling that we should be sure before we step. But that has not been the proposal up to date.

I think for another reason a more complete study should be made. As a matter of fact, all these employees have received an increase very recently. They are better off than they were, and I think we should have time to consider the matter carefully before we act.

Furthermore, we face today a tremendous difficulty in our budget figures. We do not know what the budget is going to be.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator has just made the statement that some of the employees got an increase. I should like to have him name who they are.

Mr. TAFT. We passed an act—

Mr. LANGER. We passed an act giving them an increase, and the President took off overtime, and the take-home pay of these employees is less today than it was before we passed the act.

Mr. TAFT. I do not take much stock in take-home pay. That seems to rest on the theory that one should get the same pay for working a short time as for working a long time, and I do not think that is sound. Personally I see no reason for a complete Saturday holiday in Washington. I think it is absolutely unsound, if the Senator wants to know my theory. Perhaps that is one way in which we could reduce the cost, namely, by increasing the amount of work the employees did by having them work at least half a day Saturday, and having fewer employees. But certainly we should do something, and I think the committee has some responsibility. Now they are recommending such an increase in salaries that the total represents a tremendous amount. There will be fewer employees here and there.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Since the Japanese war there has already been a substantial reduction in the Federal pay roll, both in number of employees and in amount of salaries. We have made provision for the Bureau of the Budget to put personnel ceilings on the number of employees, and we have our Appropriations Committees to work that out.

I should like to call the following figures to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Ohio: The total pay roll for employees in continental United

States for the fiscal year 1945 was \$7,327,000,000. The estimated pay roll for the next fiscal year is only \$4,248,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, those figures do not greatly impress me. In fact, they impress me rather unfavorably, since they show such a tremendous amount to be spent in the next fiscal year, when we are past the war. Of course, the war bureaus are to be cut down. I question whether any agency of the Government which was not a war or strictly an emergency agency has cut its number of employees since the war ended. In fact, they are all proposing to increase the number. It seems to me it is just one big problem, and the Federal Government must make a reasonable effort to present a budget of what the pay roll is to be after the war. There has not been a suggestion of how great a reduction in the number of employees the Government is going to make. No budget has been presented. Neither the President nor the Secretary of the Treasury has afforded us any idea of what the postwar budget will amount to. I have added the figures myself, and I find that, if the President's recommendations are enacted into law, the budget will be very close to \$26,000,000,000 a year—which is all the present tax system yields—without any further reduction of any kind, and imposing a very heavy burden on many people in the United States.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator's remarks certainly have no application to the pending issue, because there were presented to the committee most careful calculations, coming from the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and other agencies of the Government, as to the number of employees the Government would have by next July. Those figures are being and have been worked over.

The Senator from Ohio says he is not impressed by a cut of almost one-half in the Federal pay roll. I do not know what would impress the Senator. I suppose if I had said it would be down to 10 percent of what it was last year, the Senator would have made the same remark.

Mr. TAFT. No; I would not. The Senator from California mentioned, as I remember, a pay roll of over \$4,000,000,000 a year for Federal employees, and I say that that did not impress me. If that is as far as we can go by the first of next January, then I say that the Government departments and agencies are grossly overstaffed, that there will be a tremendous number of extra employees around, more than necessary to do the work, and that I am not impressed by such a figure. If the Senator suggested \$2,500,000,000 or \$3,000,000,000 I would say that was a fairly reasonable figure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. In the month of July we had what would be an annual equivalent of Federal payments for employees in continental United States, \$7,969,000,000. The figures that are being

worked out show that by next July that amount will be cut in half. Let me point out to the distinguished Senator—

Mr. TAFT. The figure was \$4,200,000,000, as I understand?

Mr. DOWNEY. Four billion two hundred and forty-eight million dollars, representing a reduction of almost one-half.

Let me also say that a large part of that is for expenditures in the Post Office Department. Last year the Post Office Department of the United States showed a profit of \$150,000,000, which went into the Treasury of the United States. Yet, in the figure \$4,248,000,000, the expenses of the workers in the Post Office Department are included. Let me add that if it were not for the right of free mail accorded to our soldiers and what we term "penalty" or "franked mail" which is sent free by governmental representatives, the Post Office Department would show a huge profit. I throw this out for whatever it may be worth: In my opinion, the cheapest service afforded the people of the United States is that which enables them to send a letter across the continent for 3 cents. If our postal service were in the hands of the Western Union or the telephone company, it would probably cost a dollar or two dollars to send a letter across the continent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REED. While the Senator from California is on his feet referring to the \$150,000,000 profit which the Post Office Department made last year, I hope he will permit me to correct the figure and make it \$112,000,000. But the Post Office Department is now running at a rate which will mean a deficit of about \$100,000,000 through this fiscal year. That, however, has nothing to do with the matter under consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my point is that the total \$4,200,000,000 Budget figure for the first of next July is not extraordinary. It does not impress me. In any event, it is admitted not to be what the postwar figure should be. We have never had any estimate of what the postwar Budget would look like. We cannot get it from the Secretary of the Treasury. We have no basis on which to figure. Yet we are constantly increasing governmental expenses, although we do not know whether we can raise by taxation the amount which will be necessary to pay the bill. I do not say that we do not have to go ahead and do some things, but I do say that when we are going ahead with a project which may increase the Budget from \$500,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 a year we should thoroughly investigate the whole business and see whether we cannot find some way to reduce the total over-all expense at the same time that we take care of the proper demands of the employees. I merely suggest that a study should be made of the situation. The House apparently is going to do it, and there is no reason why the Senate should pass on this question without doing something in the way of investigating at the same time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator must be familiar with the fact that more than 2 years ago the so-called Byrd-Langer amendment was adopted. It provided that every month each department shall make a report to the chairman of the Civil Service Committee. It is also submitted to the Comptroller of the Currency. Department after department reports to the Byrd committee. So we have a double check on the situation. The number of employees has been going down, steadily down, all the time. I do not see what a further investigation could possibly disclose, or what more the Comptroller of the Currency can do than he is doing, or what more the Director of the Budget can do than he is doing in getting rid of surplus men and women employees.

Mr. TAFT. I say that they have not done that. Of course, there has been a large reduction. Many of these employees were making munitions during the war and other things directly connected with the war. They were working in arsenals. They were engaged in work that could have no possible object except in time of war. Of course, there has been a reduction in their number, and there should be. But in the current fiscal year we are still incurring a deficit of \$35,000,000,000, for a single year, adding that much to the public debt. So far as I can see, for the fiscal year 1947 we shall have a deficit of probably \$15,000,000,000. Certainly we are not doing anything extraordinary in the way of getting Government expenses back to normal.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator to suggest what else can be done. Each month the Comptroller of the Currency and the Director of the Budget have submitted to them by the heads of the departments a report of the number of employees they have, and an investigation is being made whereby the Director of the Budget can arbitrarily remove from the pay roll any employees he finds are not needed. Congress, upon the recommendation of our committee, has given those officials that power. What else could be done?

Mr. TAFT. Permit me to make one suggestion. I suggested I saw no reason why office workers should have a complete Saturday holiday. I see some reason why in the case of industrial plants there should be a Saturday holiday; but I never have seen why office workers should have a Saturday holiday. Suppose we say, "We will give you this much more but you will work as everyone else does. You will work in the way civilian office workers work. You will work, as they do, Saturday morning and we will increase your compensation. We will then cut down by 10 percent the number of employees, because of the longer work week." I do not know whether that is a practical plan.

Mr. LANGER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that during the war

the same office workers were working all day Saturday. They had no time to go shopping. The health of many of them was impaired as a result.

Mr. TAFT. I always thought that was unreasonable also. I never could see why they should not have had a Saturday half holiday.

Mr. LANGER. They did not have it at all during the war. Now, for the first time since the war began, they are getting a few hours off.

Mr. TAFT. No; they are getting all day Saturday off.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that that is being done in industry after industry all over the United States of America.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is a great mistake so far as office work is concerned. It is not being done in ordinary downtown office work in Washington, or in many other cities. It is being done in the case of many of the office employees of industrial concerns, but it is not being done generally, and I do not see any reason why it should be. I merely suggest that that is one method we might try in an effort to cut down the ultimate total cost of this particular bill. The discussion arises on my contention that adding to the present confusion is the fact that both the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee have offered completely different plans from that approved by the committee and for that reason we should recommit the bill to the committee to consider further what plans should be adopted, and to see whether other things might be done which the committee could at least recommend, whether within their jurisdiction or not, which would reduce the overall cost of this increase.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield while I place some figures in the RECORD?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. I want to say in the first place that I know that many Senators are honestly impressed with the very general statement that has been made concerning the overwhelming number of Federal employees. It is my own opinion, after several weeks of careful investigation, that the increased personnel in the departments in Washington, eliminating the Army and Navy, about which I know nothing, is far less than one would have expected, and far less in proportion than the increased amount of business done by those agencies.

I have heard repeated remarks made by Senators—and I know they were made in good faith—referring to what they termed a million employees of the Federal Government outside continental United States. In the first place, the figure of 1,000,000 is too high. The number is 850,000. Of that 850,000, 733,000 are in the Army, and most of the remainder are in the Navy.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator means they are civilian employees in the Army?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; civilian employees, and I am about to explain what they are. I think that more Senators have said they did not see how they could vote for this pay bill because of the great volume of personnel, and they mention the figure of 1,000,000 employees who are

supposed to be abroad. I have discussed this subject carefully with the Army representatives. Of the 750,000 employees of the Army outside continental United States, one-third of them are being paid by occupied countries. In other words, the conquered governments are paying for one-third, and they are nearly all citizens of the conquered governments. Ninety percent of these employees are not citizens of the United States. Another one-third are being paid by our allies on reverse lend-lease. They are on our pay rolls, but being paid by the governments of our allies. The other one-third, comprising principally coolie labor in the Pacific area, are being paid coolie wages. They cannot be paid by our Government more than the prevailing wage in their own country, and probably the maximum amount they are receiving is \$20 a month.

In weighing this bill I do not think there is any equitable reason for thinking about the employees of the Army and Navy outside continental United States.

I want to add that the overwhelming proportion of the increased personnel in the Government is in the Army and Navy. Again, I cannot express any opinion as to whether the War Department and the Navy Department are wasteful of their manpower. The figures indicate that in June 1943 the emergency war agencies had reached their peak. In October 1945 they were down to 86,000, or about one-half the peak number. I understand that at the present time the figure is between 50,000 and 60,000. The emergency agencies are rapidly passing out of existence.

Between June 1939 and the present time the old-line agencies have increased 36 percent in personnel. According to the figures I have, the Post Office Department increased by 50 percent, but on an investigation of the Post Office Department I find that about 50,000 employees have been substitute carriers and other employees in that class, who were not carried on the pay roll 4 or 5 years ago. They cost the Government only a few dollars a month each. They are now carried on the Post Office pay rolls. In addition, the Post Office Department lost 50,000 of its best workers through the draft. It was necessary to employ 75,000 submarginal workers to take their places, and they were not able to do one-half the work that was done by the former employees. In spite of all those handicaps, the business now being done, and which has been done for the past year by the Post Office Department is far above the percentage represented by the increased number of employees.

The Senator says that none of these agencies are releasing employees. The Post Office Department is not. The Post Office Department is now employing more men than it employed in June.

Mr. TAFT. I have not even suggested a criticism of the Post Office Department.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is the largest agency outside the Army and Navy.

Mr. TAFT. What are the figures for the 1st of next July? Is any reduction proposed by the 1st of next July?

Mr. DOWNEY. By next July the Post Office Department expects to get back to practically the same number of employ-

ees that it had 4 or 5 years ago. On the average, the Post Office Department has carried one letter a day to every one of our soldiers and sailors. It has had to handle about 11,000,000 such letters a day, and it has handled them without any charge. As I previously stated, I had understood that last year the Post Office Department operated at a profit of \$150,000,000. I was corrected by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Probably his information is accurate. He gave the figure \$112,000,000.

It is true that presently the Post Office Department is operating at a deficit; but I think perhaps the prognostications of the Senator from Kansas as to what the deficit may be for this fiscal year are too pessimistic. However, I have no desire to enter into a debate on that question. So far as I am concerned, I feel that the employees of the Post Office Department have done a fine job. The largest increase has been in that Department.

The charts which I have distributed show the increases and decreases in every department—the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and so on. I have made a very careful investigation, and I find that the increased number of personnel does not nearly correspond to the increased amount of business.

Mr. President, I do not wish to hurt the feelings of any Senator or any Member of the House, but by far the greatest increase in percentage, considering the amount of money being spent for personnel presently as compared with 1941, is in the Congress of the United States. During that period of time our disbursements have gone up about 70 percent. I do not believe that that is any reason to condemn us. In my own office my business has increased from 150 to 200 percent, and my girls have often had to work until 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening, and sometimes all day Saturday and Sunday. But if my office is handling from 150 to 200 percent more business I cannot very well criticize myself or the Senate because our disbursements are comparatively the highest in the United States.

The Senator from Ohio has been very courteous. Before I conclude let me say this: I believe that we should attempt to approach these problems a trifle more calmly. I find that among 50 percent of the American people there is the folklore that Senators reach their offices about 10 or 11 o'clock every morning, have a good lunch, go to the floor of the Senate for a few minutes, and then play poker or golf for the rest of the day.

Mr. TAFT. I take every opportunity to destroy that notion.

Mr. DOWNEY. In my opinion, Senators individually are the most heavily burdened and drudging workers that I know of. Nevertheless, the impression is abroad among 50 to 75 percent of our people that we are overpaid, that we are slackers, and that we do not attend to our duties. I believe that that impression springs from a quality of the human heart which many of us have. When we make generalized statements about the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, or the Post Office Department, I

believe that many times we are falling into the same sort of unhappy error into which many of the American people fall with respect to Members of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. This bill does not cover the Post Office Department, does it?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; it does not.

Mr. TAFT. Is it anticipated that the same increase will be sought by Post Office employees?

Mr. DOWNEY. Opposition Senators have suggested that instead of counting the mere cost of this bill, we ought to calculate the amount for the postal employees and the wage-board employees. I think that is the provident thing to do.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of raising salaries and wages substantially, to the point reached in percentage by the permanent increase in the cost of living. I should say that that would certainly be 25 percent, and possibly somewhat higher. I do not think there will be any permanent decrease. I do not see how there could be any great decrease in present prices.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. In the colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from California they were speaking of the number of employees. On November 11, 1918, which was Armistice Day following the last war, there were 917,000 employees. That included the war workers. The day Mr. Roosevelt took office, on March 4, 1933, there were 555,000 employees. In October this year there were 2,643,381 civil-service employees within this country, and outside the country there were 733,792 civilian employees, making a total in October, 3 or 4 months after the war with Japan was ended, of 3,377,673, as compared with 555,000 when President Roosevelt took office, and as compared with 917,000 on Armistice Day following the First World War.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to make clear an interpretation of the figures which the Senator from Virginia has given. My figures are not quite the same as his, but generally speaking they are the same. The figure I have, representing the total number of employees for all agencies, both in and outside the United States, on September 30, 1945, is 3,360,000. That is approximately the figure which the Senator gave. Almost exactly a quarter of those, or 850,000, are principally employees of the Army and Navy outside continental United States, costing us almost nothing. Of the remaining number, about 70 percent, or a total of 2,200,000, were in the Army and Navy, 443,000 were in the Post Office Department. The total figure for those in all other agencies of the Government is 594,000, which is 36 percent more than the figure of 5 years ago. Stripping the figures down to the old-line agencies—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. We have always had an Army and Navy. The Senator from California is stripping them entirely in his

comparison. With what year is the comparison made?

Mr. DOWNEY. June 1941.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is referring to civilian employees of the Army and Navy.

Mr. BYRD. We have always had civilian employees in the Army and Navy. If the Senator wishes to make a comparison, let him add them in both instances.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not start this particular controversy. My only point was that it seemed to me that when such a tremendous cost is involved we should not arbitrarily say that everyone shall have an increase of 20 percent, or any other increase, without studying how we can reduce the total cost. No consideration has been given to that problem, and I think we could well afford to recommit the bill to the committee for that purpose.

Mr. President, I wish to suggest one further thing. There is a certain advantage in Government service which does not exist in other services. A very typical case came to my attention the other day. A man who had been in the armed forces had returned home. He had become a very excellent automobile mechanic. He wanted a job. I said to him, "It seems to me that any of the automobile companies would be willing to pay you \$10 a day. You could make probably \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year as an automobile mechanic." No; he wanted a Government job at \$1,800, if you please. Why? I suppose he figured that he would be set for life. He would have that much money for life, and he could be assured of an income. For all practical purposes, he would have permanent tenure, which does not exist in private industry. If he were in the Government service and a depression should come along, he would still retain his job. So, in spite of the fact that he could earn more in private industry, a position in the Government service appealed to him more strongly. There are some advantages in Government service which do not exist in private industry, and I believe that it is fair to take that factor into consideration.

Mr. President, there is another reason why I think we ought to postpone the question of wage increases, and particularly salary increases. I felt very strongly on the question of the amendment proposing to increase the salaries of Members of Congress. Today in this country a tremendous struggle is under way as to what wages shall be. I do not know what they ought to be. I am perfectly confident of one thing, and that is that we cannot increase wages in industry without increasing prices, and that if we have a general increase in all wages, we shall have a general increase in all prices before we are through; and to the extent that wages are increased above the cost of living, that increase is just as much inflation as would be an increase in prices. It is bound to bring about the increase in prices which we all wish to avoid.

That struggle is being fought out, and properly so, and it should be fought out in each industry and in each case and with reference to the particular groups of employees who are involved in the dis-

putes. I do not think the Government should take a position in favor of a 10 percent or 20 percent or 30 percent salary increase for its employees and thus set an example which all others would follow. I do not think the Members of Congress could increase their salaries 50 percent and not have every working man in the United States feel—and properly so—that he must be entitled to a similar increase. It can be said that some of them have already received increases greater than the increase in the cost of living. The increase in average factory wage rates has been approximately 42 percent since the beginning of the war, as compared with the 33 percent increase in the cost of living. But that does not make so much difference. If we increase the salaries of Government employees 30 percent, that percentage will be seized upon as a figure which sets an example for every other possible wage or salary increase.

We can point out that Senators and Government employees have not received any increases over certain periods of time, and we can make various arguments on that basis. Nevertheless, if we grant Government employees any salary increases at this time, that action will be bound to have a substantial effect on the struggle which now is being waged throughout the country. I do not think we know enough about what that increase should be to be justified in setting any example here by way of stating what the percentage of increase in Government salaries should be.

So, Mr. President, I feel very strongly that we should wait until next spring before we do anything in regard to increasing the salaries of Senators. I think Senators are clearly entitled to at least a 25-percent salary increase simply in order to take care of the increase which has occurred in the cost of living. Of course, many men working in industries may be entitled to a greater increase because their capacity to produce has increased, whereas it is difficult to demonstrate that the productivity of the civilian employees of the Government has increased in any way. So it seems to me that if their case for an increase in their salaries is to be justified, it must rest simply on ground that there has been an increase in the cost of living. I think we shall do far better, as a government, to say, "We will not undertake to lay down a rule. We will permit every industry by means of collective bargaining to work out the proper solution of its own particular problem, and we will not try to establish a scale or set an example in the way of an increase in the salaries of Government workers which immediately will be seized upon, it seems to me, as an argument for increases in other fields. For instance, if we grant a 10-percent increase in the salaries of Government workers, laboring people may feel that that increase reacts to their disadvantage in view of the fact that they may believe they are entitled to a 30-percent increase. On the other hand, if we grant a 20- or 30-percent increase in the salaries of Government employees, industrial employers may ob-

ject because they may say their employees should not receive more than a 10-percent increase.

In view of the fact that within the last 6 months we have granted a salary increase to Government workers, I think we can well wait another 6 months or a full year before another increase in salaries is given.

In any event, Mr. President, I would vote against any increase, and certainly I would not be willing to vote for the increase proposed in the bill.

We have two other measures which I cannot analyze at this time. I do not know how much of an increase they propose. I have seen tables covering the increase proposed by the amendment of the Senator from California. I have seen tables covering the increase proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. Frankly, I cannot analyze them quickly enough to determine just how much of an increase they would grant. But I do feel that altogether, and taking everything into consideration, it is clear that the bill should be recommitted to the committee. If that is done, then, after the bill is further considered by the committee and subsequently is reported to the Senate and is considered by the Senate, if it then contains provision for an increase in the salaries of Government employees in accordance with the increase in the cost of living, I shall be glad to vote for a bill substantially complying with that principle.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has said practically everything I could possibly say on the pending subject, and no doubt he has said it a great deal better and more forcefully than I could have done. I simply wish to make a few observations at this time about the situation.

First, Mr. President, I wish to have the Senator from California understand that I did not say or, at least, I did not intend to say, that there will be a deficit of \$100,000,000 in the Post Office Department this year. What I intended to say and what I hope I did say was that at the present rate of operation, the deficit in the Post Office Department this year will be approximately \$100,000,000, as against a \$112,000,000 surplus, as I recall the figures, for the operations during the last fiscal year.

Mr. President, I think Members of Congress should have higher salaries. Our expenses have increased; our work has increased. But I am unwilling to vote to increase my own salary or that of any other Member of Congress so long as the Government is being operated on a deficit basis. Of course, I believe that the expenses and the burdens of Members of Congress, of both Houses—I know it is true in the case of Members of the Senate—have increased. Our expenses have increased to a point where I, at least, am not able to live within the salary which I as a Senator draw from the Government. I am one of those Senators who maintain two homes. I maintain a home in Washington and one in Kansas. Our salaries are insufficient to pay our expenses in maintaining two homes and also to pay our other ex-

penses. I do not think the quality of legislators would be increased in the slightest by increasing the salaries paid to them. I do not belong to the school of those who believe that in places of distinction the salaries paid necessarily constitute a factor which influences the quality or character of the men who seek such places. But in all fairness, men who take these places, even if they ask for them—and all of us did—should receive salaries which at least suffice to pay their expenses.

The amount of my official salary does not happen to be of vital importance to me because, fortunately, out of a lifetime of effort and accumulation, I have an income outside of my senatorial salary. I know, however, that some of the most earnest and effective Members of the Senate do not have such incomes, and they necessarily must rely entirely upon their senatorial salaries to meet their expenses. To those men my heart goes out; I do not see how they do it. Some Senators who are in that position are on the floor of the Senate at this time.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator mean to imply that membership in the Congress should be denied to any person who does not have sufficient outside income, either from savings previously accrued or from outside work which he does while serving in the Congress, to enable him to meet his expenses while serving in either this body or the House of Representatives?

Mr. REED. I do not quite understand the question of the Senator from West Virginia. I ask him to repeat it, please.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to know whether the Senator from Kansas means to imply that membership in the Congress of the United States should be denied to any citizen of the United States who, either because he had not previously acquired sufficient assets or because he would not obtain outside earnings while serving as a Member of the Congress would be unable to meet the expenses which he would incur while serving in the Congress?

Mr. REED. No. My answer to the Senator from West Virginia is that we talk about sacrifices made during the war, but very few people in the United States, other than the families who contributed men and women to the armed forces, have made any real sacrifices. Most of our people had a great deal of inconvenience, yes; but sacrifices, no.

I think it is not asking too much of the Congress to request it not to increase the salaries of its Members so long as the Government is operating on a deficit basis and so long as the Government has to borrow the money with which to pay the salaries of Members of Congress and the salaries of all other Government employees.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator begs the question. I should like to have an answer to it. I do not disagree with the Senator in regard to the matter of raising salaries, but I simply wonder if it is and has been the policy of the Senator from Kansas and

of other Members of this body to adopt the view outlined in my question in regard to membership in the Congress. I have heard so much argument on the floor of the Senate along that line that sometimes I feel that possibly that is the policy of the Senate of the United States, or at least of a majority of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I can say this much to the Senator from West Virginia: I think the Congress of the United States, and I know the Senate of the United States, is more parsimonious with itself when it comes to dealing with its salaries and operating expenses than it is in dealing with the salaries or expenses of any other branch or department of the Government.

I was glad that the Senator from California decided not to offer an amendment which would have brought the question of congressional salaries to a vote.

I wish to close this phase of my remarks by repeating that I think the salaries of Members of Congress are presently inadequate. I think they should be adequate. But I hesitate very much to advocate or agree to an increase of our salaries so long as it is necessary for the Government to borrow the money with which to pay its expenses.

Now, I wish to discuss the question of the civil-service employee whose pay would be raised perhaps 20 percent by enactment of the bill reported from the committee of which the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. Downey] is chairman. I think some of our friends in the Senate emphasize too much the so-called hardships which Government employees undergo. Any group of employees who work 8 hours a day for 5 days a week, who have 26 days' annual leave with pay, who have 8 holidays a year, who receive 15 days' leave with pay if they are sick, certainly can have no case at all for relief, insofar as their working conditions are concerned.

To reduce it, Mr. President, to an hourly basis, when, under the proposed program, we take the working days of the year and deduct from them the annual leave and the holidays, we find that civil-service employees work on an average of 5 hours and 36 minutes a day. I refuse to believe that any group of workers, in the Government or anywhere else, who are working on an average of 5 hours and 36 minutes per day, are being overworked.

There is an indefinite factor which is worth referring to and given a little consideration. I have been informed by the press that the Government employees in Washington will be given a 3-day Christmas holiday. If we take into consideration the Sunday preceding, it will be 4 days. Almost every time anything of an unusual nature occurs in Washington such as a parade on Constitution Avenue or Pennsylvania Avenue, the employees of all Government departments take another holiday or part holiday. If that much time, which is an indefinite factor, is deducted, the average workday would be less than 5½ hours. So much for the

subject of working conditions. I now come to the question of salary.

Mr. President, the work of the Federal employees engaged in clerical and routine work is not hard. I have no doubt that such workers find difficulty in living under conditions which obtain in Washington at this time, and yet, Mr. President, the salaries which that class of employees receives for the work which it does exceeds the pay of employees in private institutions throughout the business life of Washington where similar work is being performed.

When the Senator from Ohio refers to persons who can earn more money outside Government than they can within the Government, that may be true. I have made no survey in that regard. However, I have discussed the matter with many persons and have found that almost universally the salaries paid by private industry in offices, in stores, and in retail and wholesale establishments—I am speaking of salaries paid by private employers in Washington—are less than those paid the low-bracket Government employees whom we are discussing. As I have said, our Government employees have, I believe, the best working conditions of any class of employees of whom I know, so far as hours of work are concerned. I do not know of any other employees who are paid annual salaries, even those within the lower brackets, who work so few number of hours during the week or month or year as do the Government workers.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio that I would be glad to see Government employees receive more money than they are now receiving. However, I want them to do more work for the money which is paid them. There is no reason why an office worker should have two holidays a week, or have Saturday off, unless we are trying to spread the work and have as many employees as it is possible to have.

Mr. President, I have been in civil service longer, I believe, than any other Member of the Senate, and almost as long as any Senator has been a Member of the Senate. It is impossible to spread work and increase salaries at the same time. If Government workers wish greater salaries, my answer to them would be, as the Senator from Ohio has stated, instead of working 40 hours a week, let them work 45 hours a week, and let them be given a half day off on Saturdays. Give them an increase of 12½ percent in their pay. If their hours of work are increased 12½ percent, give them a 12½-percent increase in their wages and decrease proportionately the total number of persons employed. That makes sense. That gives the employees more money and it does not overwork them. No sociologist or economist who has ever given a thought to this subject has ever found any reason in the world for limiting the hours in a workweek except for two reasons. The first one is that the length of the workweek imperiled the health of the worker. Certainly that factor is not even remotely on the horizon in this case. The other reason is that of spreading the work. However, we cannot spread work among a greater number of persons and at the same time increase their salaries.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I cannot say that I am persuaded by the argument which the Senator has made. But it at least has interested me. I would be further interested in knowing, if he were the dictator of our policy, how much vacation he would give employees of the Government each year. Would he give them any vacation at all?

Mr. REED. I give my own employees 2 weeks. The Senator knows that the postal workers receive only 15 days' leave of absence. They do not receive 26 days as do other Government employees in Washington.

Mr. DOWNEY. Would the Senator pursue that policy even though it resulted in increasing the number of unemployed persons throughout the Nation?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to bring an extraneous matter into this discussion, but I believe that the entire basis of economy, whether private or Government, is production. There is no way by which we can consume unless we produce. In all economic adjustments there should be recognized some relation between the cost of production in the form of wages, and the production of the commodity itself, if it can be measured in that way. Of course, Government work cannot be measured in that way.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to state to the Senator a fact, which I do not know will either interest him or influence him, and perhaps it is not even relevant. But it is expected that 18 months from now almost all the male workers in civil service will be veterans of this and, to a lesser extent, of the First World War. Perhaps 60 percent of the total number of the remaining workers will largely be the typists and stenographers who engage in work not ordinarily performed by men. It is now clearly indicated that we will not be able to find the number of jobs in civil service for perhaps anywhere near the number of veterans who are already endeavoring to find suitable jobs of every kind and cannot find them. Would the distinguished Senator feel that we were doing too much for the boys who spent 2 or 3 years away from their homes and careers in the fox holes, by giving them 26 days of vacation each year? Does he think we are doing too much by trying to spread jobs?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want to be a demagog on this floor. I have voted, as I believe every other Senator has voted, for very liberal provisions in behalf of veterans, with respect to their pay and their allowances, and for the GI bill of rights, as well as other measures which were advanced in their behalf. I do not want any hypothetical question raised at this time that some years from now we will drag in the veterans in a way which has nothing to do with the pending bill. I do not think the veteran who came out of the war whole, and has gone into Government service,

would ask for a higher rate of pay than is being paid to men in civil life who are doing a similar type of work.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, all that the pending bill proposes to do is to lift civil-service workers to the cost-of-living standard and place their compensation on a parity with what industry is paying its workers.

Mr. REED. That is the Senator's view of it. It is not my view.

Mr. DOWNEY. I know what my amendment provides. I am merely asking for an increase sufficient to bring the wages of Government workers up to a level where they can meet the cost of living.

Mr. REED. Is the Senator referring to the pending bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is practically all that the bill would do.

Mr. REED. And it is to be in addition to the pay which was granted during the present session of this Congress.

Mr. DOWNEY. The bill perhaps lifts the compensation of a few workers in the lower category above the cost of living. But it does not go even far enough to lift proportionately the compensation of the workers in the higher brackets up to the increased cost of living.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this bill comes before the Congress at the most inopportune time. In the first place, as the Senator from Ohio so very forcefully pointed out, we are in a period of economic confusion. I believe, that because of encouragement, perhaps, contained in the President's statement of some months ago, which was a far more liberal one than it should have been, hopes have been held out for higher increases to industrial workers than are probably possible of realization. For the Congress to increase Government salaries by any fixed percentage, and raise all employees from top to bottom without regard to what they do, and without regard to their conditions or the relation of their salary to the cost of living, is a mistake. It is not only a mistake in and of itself, but I fear it is tremendously confusing. The very pendency of this bill is confusing the entire labor-wage situation.

Finally, Mr. President, the Senator from California knows, from the conversations we have had, that in my opinion the debt of nearly \$300,000,000,000 which this country will face before we come back to the balancing of our budget is the most important factor existing in our whole financial and economic structure. Unless within the next 3 or 4 years we can manage to balance the budget, to take care of the interest and the service charges upon that debt, establish our credit, and bring our expenses within our revenue, the talk now being indulged, and all the ideas about raising salaries, will be futile. If we continue deficit spending without care, or apparently without reason, the credit of this country will be disturbed to the point that our debt will get beyond our credit capacity to control it, and our bonds become impaired in value because of a lack of faith in the Government. In that event the most awful catastrophe imaginable will overtake this country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. In a moment I shall be glad to yield.

I said some time ago, Mr. President, that I came here with the firm intention of doing all I could, through my votes, to preserve the credit of the Government. I did not want to vote for any appropriation unless it could be demonstrated that it was immediately necessary.

Mr. President, we cannot continue to vote \$500,000,000 for airports, \$500,000,000 for highway programs, four or five hundred million dollars, perhaps, for one bill, and a hundred million or a hundred and fifty million or two hundred or two hundred and fifty million in some other direction—it is impossible to continue on that road without utterly weakening our national credit, and that would be the worst disaster to the salaried people that could be imagined.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wished to ask the Senator whether in his opinion it is not more important to increase the salaries of our Government employees than to lend England \$4,400,000,000, and to lend Russia several hundred million dollars?

Mr. REED. I do not know yet how I shall vote on the loan to Great Britain, but I find myself slipping, and may vote for it.

The Government of the United States owes fair treatment to its workers. I owe fair treatment to those who work for me, and every employer is under the same obligation. In my opinion the United States has not failed in according its workers fair treatment.

In my home town, in the town in which the Senator from North Dakota lives, in the town in which the Senator from South Dakota lives, in the town in which the Senator from Iowa lives, the Federal workers are the best paid, where they do work comparable to that performed by private workers. That is true all over the country, with the exception of the postal workers in the large cities. We have had difficulty in keeping the postal salaries in large cities and the postal salaries in the smaller towns from coming in conflict with each other. It is a difficult problem. But there is not a Senator in this Chamber who lives in a city of less than 50,000—and I live in one of less than that number—who does not know that the Government employees are the best paid workers in the city, considering comparable employment in private business.

We are not treating our employees badly. The Senator from California made quite a point about one case a few days ago, that of Mr. Bell. It is very true there are some men in the Government service who remain in it perhaps out of public spirit, perhaps because they have been in it a long time, at lesser salaries than they would be paid in private employment if they were doing the same work in private employment. That is the class of employees in the Government service who generally receive from \$7,000 to \$8,000 up to the maximum, whatever it may be. That is not exceptional.

Men leave private employment in one place and go to private employment in

another at an increase in salary. There is something about Government work which is attractive. It is steady, it is continuous, it is not subject to the fluctuations which are found in private employment, there are long vacations—too long, I think—short hours, and sick leave. All those things tend to make Government work more attractive.

In the city of Washington the Government can always get employees in the clerical lines, because such employees receive greater salaries, as a rule, than those in private employment. It would be folly, of course, to say that there were no exceptions, but as a rule the employees in the Government offices in Washington doing clerical work receive more than they could get for doing the same kind of work for private employers.

Mr. President, the situation surrounding the pending bill is one of almost indescribable confusion. The Senator from California brought a bill to the floor. The Senator from Virginia is to offer quite an extensive amendment, perhaps in the nature of a substitute. I understand the Senator from California may perhaps modify his own bill to a material extent.

A motion to recommit the bill should not come from the Senator from Kansas or the Senator from Ohio, but I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Ohio that not only the best way but it seems to me the only way this question can be intelligently handled is by recommitting the bill to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. MEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may call for a quorum?

Mr. MEAD. It is not necessary.

Mr. LANGER. The bill now pending is a very important measure, and we would like to have a quorum present.

Mr. MEAD. Very well.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Green	Morse
Ball	Gurney	Murdock
Bankhead	Hart	Murray
Bilbo	Hawkes	Myers
Bridges	Hill	O'Daniel
Bushfield	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Capper	Kilgore	Reed
Carville	Knowland	Revercomb
Chavez	La Follette	Robertson
Connally	Langer	Russell
Donnell	McClellan	Shipstead
Downey	McKellar	Smith
Ellender	McMahon	Tunnell
Ferguson	Mead	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, a few days ago I discussed the bill which is now before the Senate, and I explained my position with reference to it as it was reported from the Civil Service Committee.

I am now going to speak against a motion to recommit the bill, or the substitute, to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is a motion pending to recommit the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no motion pending to recommit.

Mr. MEAD. If my colleague from Iowa had waited, I was about to add "in the event that such a motion is made." I heard the statement made by the able Senator from Ohio, as I hope my distinguished colleague from Iowa did, and I intend to deal with it a little later.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, we have before us a substitute measure which may give some inspiration to a motion to recommit the bill. In order to bring before the Senate a question which will be properly before the Senate, I suggest to the able chairman of the Civil Service Committee that he withdraw his amendment and reinstate the bill as reported to the Senate by the Civil Service Committee, so that we may all know what is before the Senate and what the provisions of the bill are.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. While I am confident that the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have presented would be more acceptable to the Senate, and I myself would prefer to press it, in view of the practical impossibility of having the attention of Senators long enough to explain it, I have a sense of discouragement in having them understand what it is, and I therefore think the suggestion of the Senator from New York is well taken. Consequently, for the present I will withdraw the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am well pleased with the action taken by the able chairman of the Civil Service Committee, because there has been confusion in this body, but if we return to the bill as reported by the committee we shall have before us a copy of the bill as reported. We shall have before us a report from the Committee on Civil Service, and we shall have the benefit of that explanation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Did the Senator from California withdraw his amendment?

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from California stated that he would withdraw the amendment. I understand that he will probably go through the proper parliamentary procedure to do so when he has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has a right to withdraw his amendment, and he has done so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, as I understand, the state of the Record at the moment is that the Record shows

that the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from California has now actually been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, we are now considering the bill as reported by the Committee on Civil Service. We can properly follow that bill, because we have a printed copy of it before us. We have an explanation of the bill before us in the report which the Civil Service Committee has submitted with the bill.

Mr. President, this is a very simple measure. It calls for an increase of 20 percent over the existing wage level. That is a very simple issue. It was well explained by the able chairman of the committee. The cost-of-living feature which prompted the majority of the committee to report the bill favorably to the Senate is likewise easy to understand. That too was dwelt upon at great length by the chairman of the committee.

The application of the 20-percent yardstick maintains a differential in the various classifications in the civil-service categories, from the top to the bottom. If there are Members of the Senate who feel that the 20-percent increase is not sufficient, or is too much, they have an opportunity to offer amendments to increase or reduce that figure. But, Mr. President, I do not believe that we ought to adopt the ancient device of recommending the bill to the committee for further consideration and study. That device was used in the first Congress which was assembled in this building. It has been used in every subsequent session of every Congress that has ever been held.

This bill was introduced in accordance with parliamentary procedure. It was referred to the appropriate committee. It was considered by that committee. Hearings were held by the committee. Witnesses were summoned from the rank-and-file to the grade of Cabinet officer, and after the hearings were held, the committee voted in executive session to report the bill to the Senate, and the bill was reported to the Senate and placed upon the calendar in the regular way.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. In connection with that statement, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that extensive hearings were held last spring upon the pay bill which we then passed. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and other Senators desired to have a considerable higher increase than was then allowed. We did approve the provision for overtime pay, in addition to an increase in the basic allowance. There was a full study of the pay scale at that time, and I believe that a majority of the committee then stated that whenever overtime pay was done away with it would be the disposition of the committee to bring in a bill which would increase Government salaries above the cost-of-living standard.

Mr. MEAD. That was my understanding, Mr. President. Overtime payments have been eliminated, which in my judgment is another justification for the immediate consideration of this legislation.

If we send the bill back to the committee I am not sure that there will be any greater interest in it, or that any greater number of Members of the Senate will be concerned over it than is the case at the present time. In fact, I believe that this is the appropriate time. I believe that as a result of several days of discussion there is great interest in the bill. Therefore I hope it will not be recommitted, and that we may proceed to reconsider the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission has been brought into this debate. The Civil Service Commission has approved the bill. I remember when it was always necessary—or at least helpful—for the Civil Service Commission to recommend or approve legislation having to do with wages and working conditions of the personnel employed by the United States. After all, it is the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission to recruit personnel for the various departments and agencies of the United States. They know how difficult and expensive that operation is, because of the rapid turn-over in Government employment. They know more, perhaps, than any other agency of the Government about the difficulties which beset them in the proper recruitment and organization of Government personnel. We have the approval of the Civil Service Commission of the bill which has been reported by the committee. Moreover, the President of the United States favors the principles contained in this bill. In my judgment that is an added reason why the Senate should not recommit the bill to a committee which has already given consideration to it.

Mr. President, other arguments have been advanced. It has been suggested that we wait until next year, to find out what the Budget will be. I think it will be a source of great encouragement to an underpaid typist, stenographer, or clerk when he is told to wait until we know more about what the budget is to be before we allow him sufficient salary to keep body and soul together.

It has been suggested that it is inopportune to raise wages now, and that we should put it off until we balance the Budget. I think that would be marked encouragement to the poor people of the District of Columbia who are working for Uncle Sam at salaries which in my judgment are inadequate. It is proposed that we tell them to wait until some time in the future, until we can balance the Budget, before we take care of them.

Mr. President, not very long ago we repealed the excess-profits tax. We did not say to the corporations, "You must wait until we balance the Budget, or until next year, when we know how much it is going to cost to operate the Government." Not long ago we reduced the taxes on corporations. We did not say to them, "You must wait until we balance the Budget." No. But we use that argument now, when it applies to the lowly paid wage earners employed by the Government of the United States.

Not long ago we talked about lending foreign governments billions of dollars, and evidently we are about to do it. But we are not going to say to those govern-

ments, "You must wait until we balance our Budget. You must wait until we know how much money we shall need next year." Oh, no. We use that argument only when it applies to the poor devil who works for the Government of the United States.

Just a few days ago we rescinded appropriations of \$52,000,000,000 which we had already made for the conduct of the war. Less than half a billion dollars will be required to cover the entire cost of this bill for a whole year, and before that year is up the personnel will be reduced in many instances. Perhaps the total reduction will absorb a great percentage of the cost of the bill. But if the war had lasted another week we should have spent a great deal more than we would spend for the cost of this bill for an entire year.

Mr. President, I am for the consideration of the bill which is now before the Senate, a bill with which we are all familiar, a bill which has been reported to this body by the proper committee. I really believe that it would be a serious mistake and that we would be inconsistent with ourselves and our record if we were to send the bill back to the Committee on Civil Service. So I am appealing to the Senate now, in the event that a motion is made to recommit the bill, to vote down the motion and proceed in an orderly manner to consider the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Civil Service. If there is anything wrong with that bill, we shall have ample opportunity to correct it. If it is insufficient in the increases which it proposes, we can modify it. So I appeal to the Senate to consider the bill which has been reported by its own Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	Mitchell
Bridges	Hawkes	Morse
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Murray
Capper	Hill	O'Daniel
Carville	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Huffman	Radcliffe
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Donnell	Knowland	Taft
Downey	Langer	Taylor
Gerry	McClellan	Tunnell
Gossett	McKellar	White
Green	Maybank	Wiley
Guffey	Mead	
Gurney	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senator; and Mr. BALL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. VANDENBERG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. BANKHEAD entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to propound an inquiry to the Senator from California. As I understand, he has withdrawn his substitute which he offered this morning. Am I correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Does that mean that the amendment which the Senator had pending will be reinstated?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I make no statement on that point. I have withdrawn my amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to send forward, and to have lie on the table, two amendments which are being proposed by myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], who are members of the Civil Service Committee. I ask that the amendments and a table in explanation of their objectives be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendments submitted by Mr. BYRD for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HART were received, ordered to lie on the table and be printed, and the amendments and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BYRD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HART to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, viz: On page 1, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a) the first sentence of section 405 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: 'Each of the existing rates of basic compensation set forth in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except those affected by subsection (b) of this section, is hereby increased by 36 percent of that part thereof which is not in excess of \$1,200 per annum, plus 18 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of \$1,200 per annum but not in excess of \$4,600 per annum, plus 9 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of \$4,600 per annum.'"

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BYRD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HART to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, viz: Beginning on page 1, line 9, strike out all down to and including line 16 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) (1) The proviso to the fifth paragraph under the heading 'Crafts, Protective,

and Custodial Service' in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That charwomen working part time be paid at the rate of 88 cents an hour, and head charwomen at the rate of 93 cents an hour.

"(2) Such section is amended so as to provide the following rates of compensation for positions in the clerical-mechanical service:

"Grade 1, 88 to 95 cents an hour.

"Grade 2, \$1.01 to \$1.09 an hour.

"Grade 3, \$1.17 to \$1.23 an hour.

"Grade 4, \$1.31 to \$1.45 an hour.

"(c) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this section shall not be construed to be an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"Sec. 2. Section 602 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words 'section 405 of this act,' wherever they occur in such section, a comma and the words 'as amended.'

"Sec. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: 'Except as provided in section 503, each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional compensation computed as follows: 36 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of \$1,200 per annum, plus 18 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of \$1,200 per annum but not in excess of \$4,600 per annum, plus 9 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of \$4,600 per annum.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 521 of such act is amended to read as follows: 'Each officer and employee in or under the judicial branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional basic compensation computed as follows: 36 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of \$1,200 per annum, plus 18 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of \$1,200 per annum but not in excess of \$4,600 per annum, plus 9 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of \$4,600 per annum.'

"Sec. 4. Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words 'by reason of the enactment of this act' the words 'or any amendment thereto.'"

TABLE I

Rates on June 30, 1945	Present rate (Public Law 106) effective July 1, 1945	Proposed amendment 36-18-9 percent over June 30, 1945, rates	Percentage increase, proposed amendment over present base rates under Public Law 106	Percentage increase, proposed amendment over June 30, 1945, base rates ¹
\$1,200	\$1,440	\$1,632.00	13.33	36.00
1,440	1,704	1,915.20	12.39	33.00
1,620	1,902	2,127.60	11.86	31.33
1,800	2,100	2,340.00	11.43	30.00
2,000	2,320	2,576.00	11.03	28.50
2,300	2,650	2,930.00	10.57	27.39
2,400	2,760	3,048.00	10.43	27.00
2,600	2,980	3,284.00	10.20	26.31
2,900	3,310	3,638.00	9.91	25.45
3,200	3,640	3,992.00	9.67	24.75
3,500	3,970	4,346.00	9.47	24.17
3,800	4,300	4,700.00	9.30	23.68
4,600	5,180	5,644.00	8.96	22.70
5,200	5,810	6,298.00	8.49	21.12
5,600	6,220	6,734.00	8.09	20.25
6,000	6,650	7,170.00	7.82	19.50
6,500	7,175	7,715.00	7.53	18.69
7,000	7,700	8,260.00	7.27	18.00
7,500	8,225	8,805.00	7.05	17.40
8,000	8,750	9,350.00	6.86	16.88
8,500	9,275	9,895.00	6.68	16.41

¹ Percentages indicated reflect the aggregate of increases under Public Law 106 and the proposed amendment, but do not reflect within-grade increases or promotions.

Table I (above) shows results of a 36-18-9 percent pay-increase formula when applied to the Federal compensation rates as of June 30, 1945.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from California—

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator decides to start his speech this evening, I am wondering how long he is likely to proceed. It is now almost 5 o'clock. I do not know but perhaps the acting majority leader is now ready to move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I expect to cover this subject at some length. I expect to begin by giving a history of this type of legislation and lead up to where we are at the present time. I will consume some time. I have no objection, if it is desired, to have the matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I believe that it is the wish of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], that the Senate proceed for a while longer. I think we might continue for a while and allow the Senator from Iowa an opportunity to begin his speech before we take a recess.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Very well.

Mr. President, I approach this point in the consideration of the pending bill with some confusion in my mind. The confusion is especially heightened because, as a member of the Committee on Civil Service, I have had a little to do with the proposed legislation, as well as the legislation which became effective last July 1.

At the outset it may be stated that we are dealing here with a very substantial sum of public money. The pending bill, in the form in which it is now before the Senate, involves a potential expenditure, in addition to the expenditures which we are now making for public salaries, of a sum somewhat in excess of \$1,000,000,000 a year. The bill does not specifically apply to any persons except those within the classified civil service. As I understand, the amount of money involved will be approximately \$600,000,000 a year.

Most of the various documents now lying on the desks of Senators, and under various authorships, begin with the proponents of the measure in its present form prefacing much of the assumption of the cost of this bill as contained in their literature upon the premise or allegation that the number of employees on the Federal pay roll will have been reduced by next July to 2,000,000. The number of employees on the Federal pay roll today, considering those under the Wage Board, is between three and three and a half million. According to one statistical sheet which I have received and which was allegedly compiled from Government sources, the Federal pay roll for the fiscal year of 1945 is \$7,327,000,000. In any event, the amount is in excess of \$7,000,000,000.

While the pending bill applies only to those who are in the classified civil service, I think it has been amply demonstrated and admitted by both sides of the controversy that whatever is done for the classified civil-service employees will

of necessity be extended to the public employees in other branches of the service until all the public employees will receive substantially the same percentage of increase that is provided for in the pending bill. Therefore, if the experience of the past means anything, I think we may say that, in this bill, we are dealing with a 20-percent increase across the board on \$7,000,000,000, because that is the 1945 fiscal pay roll.

I think it is fair to say that that amount has been reduced somewhat by small reductions in public personnel. But the figure still stands roughly at \$7,000,000,000 annually. If, during the course of public administration, because of the legislative attitude, and governmental pressure, we grant an increase to this great segment of the public employees, it is certain that the increase will be applied to the other segments as well. That will mean \$1,400,000,000 if the Government continues to employ substantially the same number of employees that it employs now.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I think the Senator is in error in his last statement, in that he has not taken into account the fact that practically all overtime has been done away with. In July the overtime, on an annual basis, was a billion, seven hundred million dollars. While the overtime was not nearly so great in the last fiscal year, when we had a total pay roll of over \$7,000,000,000, the doing away with overtime alone will reduce the total cost to the Government by approximately 25 percent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from California, Mr. President, that at the same time we did away with the overtime, by the bill taking effect the 1st of last July, we increased the pay of the classified employees, and I may say to the Members of the Senate that we are now preparing to increase the pay of postal employees in accordance with some general understandings which were had last spring, and that the increase effected by the bill which went into effect on July 1, amounted to 15.9 percent. So that the overtime that was taken away, decreasing the amount of actual dollars the employees received, was offset in great measure by the increase in base pay that was granted in the law which went into effect the 1st of July. The amount is still somewhere in the neighborhood of \$7,000,000,000. I think it is of little consequence, because I have at least five sets of statistics in my files, each compiled by allegedly capable and responsible governmental agencies, no two of which agree in their figures within about 7 percent. In addition to that, the committee of the Senator from Virginia on reduction of nonessential Federal expenditures has compiled statistics directly from Federal bureau and agency heads themselves, and those statistics do not coincide, accurate as the sources may be, with these other statistics, by a few percent. They all add up, however, to the fact that this

pay-roll bill is going to cost somewhere between six and a half billion and seven billion dollars as it now stands. The measure proposed, in the form in which it is before the Senate at the moment, proposes a 20-percent increase to the classified employees, which will automatically, and in the very course of political and public events, be extended to the other employees of the Government. If it is given to the classified employees, it should be given to the other employees of the Government. Public morality and public responsibility would demand that that be done.

Mr. President, that is what we are dealing with, a bill involving increases in excess of a billion dollars a year, at a time when we have just ended the greatest financial and human effort this Nation and the world ever saw, and when we should be getting back to some kind of a basis of public and private financial sanity, when this Nation of ours, which has been built upon that principle, should go forward and reconstruct itself for that glorious tomorrow to which so much lip service is rendered, but to which so little support in the Halls of the Congress and in the minds of administrative officials apparently is being given.

Last spring the question of the pay of public employees was a very pertinent one. It was recognized that the public employees had not been given increases commensurate with the increases in similar lines of activity in other employments, that no substantial increase had been given to the employees since 1941, and that some consideration should be given to them. At that time we had hearings before the Committee on Civil Service. The Senator from California then, as now, was zealous to see that what he in his opinion thought was justice was done.

The committee had what I thought were some extremely harmonious meetings. Serious attention was given to the subject, with a realization that there was a problem, and at that time, because of the restriction imposed by the Little Steel formula, the committee was confined within certain limits so as not to violate the 15-percent increase laid down in the Little Steel formula and the "hold the line" policy.

It was recognized at that time that the cost of living probably had risen in the neighborhood of 30 percent, because that was developed by the evidence, and there was no dispute about it, except in the case of private figures. There was no dispute as to the cost of living in governmental figures, those of the Civil Service Commission, and even of the employee groups themselves. Based on the limitation of the Little Steel formula and, with this knowledge of the increase in the cost of living, the committee did give an increase that amounted to approximately 15.9 percent in the aggregate.

I will say to the Senator from California that it was recognized at that time that probably a more substantial increase should have been given in order to bring the compensation of Federal employees up to a point that would meet the increase in the cost of living. But I shall have to dispute the statement

of the Senator from California that it was understood, or agreed, or even contemplated at that time, that the increases later to be considered would bring the salaries up to a point above the cost of living increase. It is my recollection, though I have no particular record of private conversations at that time, that the general sense of the committee was that we should sometime after the first of the year, when the restriction of the Little Steel formula should be removed, then seriously consider a readjustment of the Federal-pay scale, in an attempt reasonably to approach, under all conditions, the increased cost of living as a factor in the pay scale and pay roll of the Federal Government. The degree of the increase, or its amount, according to my recollection, was not specifically discussed, nor did I have any firm idea of what it might be. The bill went into effect the 1st of July, and it has been in effect since.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wonder if the Senator would allow me to interpolate that since that 16-percent raise was a graduated raise, it did raise those drawing above \$8 000 only to the extent of 9 percent of their basic salaries. I would like to have the record made complete.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that is entirely correct, but I may say that in considering the wage adjustment at that time, as I recall—and I cannot speak for any other member of the committee, and do not intend to commit any other member of the committee—the whole philosophy of that increase in salary was that neither at that time, nor in considering wage increases in the future, was a basic readjustment of Federal wages to be considered. Rather were we considering the human, equitable readjustment of wages in this emergency period to meet the living costs, the living necessities created by the unusual situation of war, and all the economics that go with it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. All I want to emphasize is that we did recognize at that time that the cost of living had increased approximately 30 percent. I personally believed then it was up 33 or 35 percent, but we used the figure 30 percent, which was then the official figure, and we were only giving a basic rate in the higher brackets of 9 percent, which, of course, resulted in the increase in the upper brackets still being something like 22 or 23 percent below the increased cost of living, which, of course, meant that much of an actual cut in real purchasing power.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will come to that point in a moment. I say again that what I have stated was my understanding of the philosophy of the legislation passed at that time and of its intents and purposes and what we were trying to arrive at. It does little good at this time to say what this or that Member said, but there was a divergence of opinion in the committee, and yet I think a harmonious unity of opinion was reached eventually.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I, and I believe the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], in trying to approach this problem made some suggestions about a graduated scale of increase. Because of the fact that the fiscal year began the 1st of July, the time was then so short that something had to be done rather drastically, and perhaps roughly, so far as any analytical studies were concerned. The proposal was therefore made, in order to meet this situation and so the increase could begin on the first of the fiscal year, that a 20-percent increase be given on the first \$1,200 of salary, with 10 percent on the overplus of \$1,200 to \$4,600, and that 5 percent on salaries over \$4,600 be given.

The theory of that increase, Mr. President, as I understand it—and certainly I will say, as I know I intended it—was that the impact of the cost of living in these days of unusual economic turmoil comes upon the necessities of life, comes upon the needed food, the needed clothing, the needed schooling, all the things that go into the necessities of life for the little man; and by the little man I mean the one in the low salary brackets, who spends from 90 to 100 percent of everything he can earn on the necessary costs of living. Everything he earns as a rule goes for food, clothing, shelter, medical supplies, and the other necessities of family life or individual life. Therefore, when the cost of living goes up beyond the point where he is normally able to meet it, it rises above the level of what he is already spending and he does not have the surplus money to meet it, nor does he have the excess salary to absorb it.

Let me show how it worked out. Under the legislation which became effective on the 1st of last July, the employee who was receiving \$1,200 was increased to \$1,440, I believe. Will the Senator from California correct me if I am in error? I believe we fixed a minimum of \$1,500 in that measure.

Mr. DOWNEY. One thousand four hundred and forty dollars.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not read the law recently—that is, in the last few days—but it was my recollection that no salary was to be under \$1,500.

Mr. DOWNEY. One thousand four hundred and forty dollars became the minimum.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Anyway, the one who theretofore received \$1,200 received \$1,440, or a \$240 increase. Remember that we were giving this increase to meet the increased cost of necessities, the increased cost of living. It was not a basic wage adjustment. It was not made on the basis of a survey between grades in the public service to see whether this grade was getting the correct pay in comparison to that one, or a survey to evaluate the services and see whether the pay was too much or too little.

An employee who received \$1,200 was given a \$240 raise. On his salary above \$1,200 he received an increase of 10 percent on all the overplus of his salary up to \$4,600. That gave the employee who received \$4,000 \$220 on the first \$1,200 and 10 percent on the next \$2,800, or

\$280 more. So he received an increase of somewhere between \$400 or \$500. That increase was a dollar increase. That increase was money in his pocket with which he could buy more food needed for his family, or with which he could buy food at higher prices.

The employee in the bracket from \$7,000 to \$7,500 received an increase of 6 or 7 percent—perhaps it was six and a fraction percent. The employee who received \$7,500 was given a 7.5-percent increase. Seven percent on \$7,000 is \$490. The employee whose salary was \$7,000 received roughly \$500 more in his pocket with which to pay for the necessities of living, the food and clothing which he and his family had to buy.

An employee who received a salary of \$9,000 was given an increase of \$640. He received 6.53 percent increase on his salary. He got a little bit more by way of increase than the employees whose salary was \$7,000, in order to meet the necessities of life.

This was not done to readjust the ratio in the pay scale between what he was doing, and what another employee down the line or up the line from him was doing, but to meet the cost of living, to meet the emergency situation, to meet the increased prices. That was the situation with respect to the measure which became effective July 1 last.

TRANSFER TO TEXAS OF LAND AND PERSONAL PROPERTY IN LIMESTONE COUNTY

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar, S. 1471, Calendar No. 791, which should have immediate consideration, by reason of the fact that failure to pass the bill heretofore is delaying action in taking care of certain incapacitated persons in the State of Texas. The bill has the approval of everyone concerned, including the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and was approved unanimously by the committee and was reported to the Senate. The urgency in the matter is due to the fact that the bill must go to the House of Representatives in order to be passed before Christmas. It concerns a parcel of land in Texas which is owned by a Texas corporation, which desires to transfer it to another Texas corporation under the control of the Board of Control, which handles all eleemosynary institutions in the State of Texas. These institutions are overcrowded, and the jails are filled with poor unfortunate individuals who cannot be taken care of properly.

Passage of the bill is necessary because the Texas corporation which originally owned the land transferred it to the Secretary of Agriculture, as a trustee, to hold in trust, for the purpose of rehabilitating farm families. The Secretary of Agriculture was unable to perform that function, and later the war came on and he permitted the use of the property for prisoner-of-war camps. Now it is unfit for the original purpose, and all parties concerned, including the War Department, the Surplus Property Cus-

todian, the Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture, and all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have agreed that the bill should be passed giving the Secretary of Agriculture permission to transfer the property to the State of Texas.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the bill applies only to a piece of property in the State of Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. And the bill was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and has the approval of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct. It meets with entire approval.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that the bill has been considered by all members of the committee, on both sides of the aisle, and that they all feel the same way about it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is true. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1471) to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to transfer, convey, grant, and quitclaim unto Texas Rural Communities, for subsequent use by or transfer to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State Board of Control, for the benefit and rehabilitation of convalescent or handicapped residents of the State of Texas, all right, title, claim, interest, equity, and estate in and to the real and personal property comprising the Mexia Colony project of Farm Security Administration, Limestone County, Texas, presently administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as trustee under an agreement of transfer, dated October 31, 1939, with Texas Rural Communities.

SEC. 2. Such transfer by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be subject to any legal rights existing by virtue of any lease or other agreement by the Secretary, his successors or representatives, as such trustee.

SEC. 3. Any such transfer shall not be deemed to impose any liability upon the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to his obligations under such agreement of transfer of October 31, 1939.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Iowa for yielding.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For what purpose?

Mr. BYRD. Very few Senators are in the Chamber, and I should like to have more Senators hear the Senator's speech. Would it be in order to make the point of no quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make the point of no quorum at this time. It is now nearly half past 5. If it is agreeable to the Senator from California, I should like to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Iowa is making a constructive and valuable statement on this subject. It ought to be heard by as many Senators as possible. I agree that it would be well to take a recess at this time, with the hope, at least, that more Senators may be present tomorrow to listen to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield so that I may move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, District of Columbia, for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. F. Arthur Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary; and

Sundry officers for appointment in the foreign service of the United States.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur A. Quinn to be comptroller of customs for customs collection district

No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 13 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Chaplain Luther Deck Miller (brigadier general, Chief of Chaplains), United States Army.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Emil J. Koch, Warner Springs, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

FLORIDA

Nell H. Connell, Weirsdale, Fla., in place of T. F. Connell, retired.

GEORGIA

Carr McLemore, Surrency, Ga., in place of E. S. Brindle, retired.

ILLINOIS

Lucille G. I. Johnson, Malden, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert L. Ryerson, West York, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

IOWA

Ralph L. Zearley, Garber, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Enolla T. Ordoyne, Larcose, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Mary E. Burbank, Maplewood, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Earle S. Treend, Gobles, Mich., in place of Earl Hudson, removed.

MISSOURI

Harvey H. Reynolds, Cairo, Mo., in place of R. L. McKinney, resigned.

Irvin P. Swift, Delta, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Christena Ramsey, Novelty, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Salem Abraham, Ainsworth, Nebr., in place of E. D. Collins, retired.

William G. Hoffman, Bladen, Nebr., in place of F. B. Householder, transferred.

NEW YORK

Josephine E. Morrison, Lake Pleasant, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jane M. Phillis, Fombell, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence C. MacKenzie, Hatboro, Pa., in place of A. C. Winner, deceased.

Lillian J. Biggerstaff, Hunkers, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George R. Frey, Kutztown, Pa., in place of R. D. Stein, killed in action.

Grace F. Brant, Plumville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Verna Heppes, Sheppton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

David J. Scales, Jr., Susquehanna, Pa., in place of E. J. Holleran, deceased.

TEXAS

Lula M. Winfough, Darrouzett, Tex., in place of M. L. Beck, resigned.

Roy L. Nickels, McAdoo, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary Newman Lemmons, Pantex, Tex. Office became Presidential April 1, 1945.

Bernice E. McCoy, Prairie Lea, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John F. Dickinson, Riviera, Tex., in place of L. H. North, resigned.

Reid B. Horney, Robstown, Tex., in place of O. T. Kellam, resigned.

Viola I. Havenhill, Twitty, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WASHINGTON

Lora M. Antoine, Chelan Falls, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Carrie Vos, Kansasville, Wis., in place of A. H. Vos, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 13 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Arthur A. Quinn, to be comptroller of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

POSTMASTERS

MARYLAND

Maude R. Phelps, Clarksville.

Mary E. Cavey, Ilchester.

Ethel Goddard, St. Marys City.

OREGON

Margery A. Kron, Garden Home.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, hold us to the realization that tomorrow we shall be judged by a generation which has the right to the inheritance of our faith today. Ours is a declared responsibility of good government, and herein we must match our faith against all difficulties. While nations are in turmoil and disquiet is sweeping our business world, while restlessness is running through human ranks with easy contagion, and trembling hearts are passing down into the valley where lie the long shadows of sorrow, O infinite Father, show our country the way to deliverance. O grip its thought with a passionate patriotism, that unhappi-